

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01662714 3

HISTORY OF THE POPES.

VOL. XII.

PASTOR'S HISTORY OF THE POPES.

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES. Translated from the German of Dr. LUDWIG PASTOR. Edited, as to Vols. I.-VI., by the late FREDERICK IGNATIUS ANTROBUS, and, as to Vols. VII.-XII., by RALPH FRANCIS KERR of the London Oratory. In 14 Volumes.

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| Vols. I. and II. | A.D. 1305-1458. |
| Vols. III. and IV. | A.D. 1458-1483. |
| Vols. V. and VI. | A.D. 1484-1513. |
| Vols. VII. and VIII. | A.D. 1513-1521. |
| Vols. IX. and X. | A.D. 1522-1534. |
| Vols. XI. and XII. | A.D. 1534-1549. |
| Vols. XIII. and XIV. <i>in preparation.</i> | |

112735-4

THE
HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

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

FROM THE GERMAN OF

DR. LUDWIG PASTOR,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF INNSBRUCK, AND
DIRECTOR OF THE AUSTRIAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE IN ROME.

EDITED BY

RALPH FRANCIS KERR

OF THE LONDON ORATORY.

VOLUME XII.

12735-4
18/4/13

LONDON:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO., LTD.
BROADWAY HOUSE, 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.

1912.

Bx

955

P35

1898

v. 12

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XII.¹

	PAGE
Table of Contents	vii
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix	xxix

PAUL III., 1534-1549.

Ignatius of Loyola and the Society of Jesus	1-57
Constitutions of the Society of Jesus. Its work in Europe and the Indies	58-123
The Turkish war. The meeting between Paul III. and Charles V. at Lucca. The conciliar question, 1541-1543.	124-168
The meeting between Paul III. and Charles V. at Busseto. Suspension of the Council. The Pope's neutrality and exertions for peace. Misunderstandings with the Emperor	169-203
Spread of the German schism. Cardinal Farnese's mission to Worms. Negotiations for an alliance between Paul III. and Charles V. against the Protestants. Investiture of Pier Luigi Farnese with Parma and Piacenza. The convening of the Council of Trent	204-239
Transactions and decrees of the five first sessions of the Council of Trent (December 1545 to June 1546)	240-271
The Papal-Imperial league of June 1546. The Schmalkaldic war	272-299

¹ For Bibliography see Volume XI.

A.D.		PAGE
1528	He goes to Paris (February 2nd), and followers gather round him	21
1534	The vows taken by Ignatius and his six companions at Montmartre (August 15th)	22
1536	They leave Paris and go to Venice	23
	To await a vessel to take them to Palestine	24
	This being impossible, they resolve to visit the Italian Universities	25
	Ignatius and the first Jesuits in Rome	26
1538	Ten members of the Society now in the city—their work	27
	Attacks on the Society—Ignatius' interview with Paul III. at Frascati	29
	The Jesuits completely acquitted—Ignatius says his first Mass on Christmas Day	30
	The Society placed "unreservedly at the disposal of the Pope"	31
	Discussion on the vow of obedience	32
	The "Constitutions" submitted for examination	33
1540	They are confirmed by the Pope (September 27th)	34
1541	Ignatius chosen (April) General of the Society	36
	Various privileges granted by the Pope	37
1549	These are ratified by a Bull (October 18th)	38
	Beginnings of the house and church of the "Gesù"	39
	Works undertaken by the Society in Rome	40
	The houses of S. Marta and S. Caterina	42
	Work in the hospitals	44
	Ignatius and the dispute between Paul III. and the King of Portugal	45
	The work of instruction in Christian doctrine	50
1547	The Roman clergy enjoined to attend lectures by the Jesuits	51
	Ignatius declines the direction of convents of nuns	52
	Difficulties with Isabel Roser and her associates	52
	Refusal of Ignatius to amalgamate with other Orders	54
	And opposes the acceptance of dignities	55
	Method of Ignatius in training his companions	56

CHAPTER II.

CONSTITUTIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.—ITS WORK IN EUROPE AND THE INDIES.

	Need of a Rule consolidated in writing	58
1547	Ignatius begins to commit his work to writing	58
1550	The final "Formula of the Institute" confirmed by Julius III., July 21st.	59

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ix

A.D.		PAGE
1552	The Constitutions promulgated throughout the Society. Method followed by St. Ignatius in writing the Constitutions	60
	The scope, object, and description of the enactments of the Constitutions	61
	The definition of "blind obedience"	67
	End for which the colleges are called into being	69
	The fourth solemn vow	70
	The educational rules of the Constitutions	71
	The Society, despite its complexity, must maintain its characteristic of unity	73
	Means of attaining this solidarity	74
	St. Ignatius rejects the old methods	76
	"To the greater glory of God"	77
1545	The first Jesuits at the Council of Trent	78
	Instructions given to them by Ignatius	79
	Layne and Salmeron at Trent	80
1546	Letter of Salmeron to Ignatius (July)	81
1547	As a consequence of the work of the Jesuits at the Council, many bishops wish to have them in their dioceses	82
1545	Beginnings of the Society in Venice	83
	Whither Laynez is sent by the Pope	84
	Many Italian bishops obtain the services of the Jesuits Who go to Montepulciano, Verona, Minori, Faenza	84
	Belluno and Modena; in the latter place Salmeron has difficulties with Cardinal Morone	85
	Le Jay sent to Modena to counteract the influence of the Duchess Renée	86
	The Society in Florence and Parma	87
	In Casola, Correggio, and Castiglione, etc.	88
1547	Beginnings of the Society in Sicily	89
	Canisius and ten others go to Messina	90
1539	The first Jesuits to enter Spanish territory	91
	They are defended by Prince Philip	92
1544	In spite of opposition many colleges are founded	92
	Salamanca is the centre of this opposition	93
	The Dominican, Melchior Cano, and the Jesuits	94
	Early life of Francis Borgia	96
1548	His profession in the Society (February 1st)	97
	The King of Portugal asks for Jesuit missionaries for the East Indies	98
1545	Rodriguez in Portugal—foundation of the College of Coimbra	99
1542	Salmeron and Broët visit Ireland, passing by way of Scotland	100

A.D.		PAGE
1542	Beginnings of the Society in France	101
	Work of Peter Faber at Louvain	102
1540	Commencement of his work in Germany	103
1542	Visits Spire, Mayence, and Cologne	104
	At the latter place founds the first Jesuit settlement in German territory	105
	Work of Le Jay in Bavaria and other parts of Germany	106
1543	Activity of his colleague, Bobadilla	108
	The first German Jesuit: Peter Canisius	109
1549	Jesuits sent to the University of Ingolstadt	111
	Canisius begins his lectures there (November 26th)	112
	Missions of the Society to Abyssinia and the Congo	113
1540	St. Francis Xavier starts (March 16th) on his mission to the Indies	114
	His labours at Goa and in the neighbourhood	115
	His manner of life and work—his successes	116
1549	Is named Provincial for India	118
	Starts from Malacca for Japan (June 24th)	120
	Ignatius and Xavier what they were through the Papacy	122
	“Manresa the grammar school, Rome the University”	122

CHAPTER III.

THE TURKISH WAR.—THE MEETING BETWEEN PAUL III. AND
CHARLES V. AT LUCCA.—THE CONCILIAR QUESTION, 1541–1543.

1541	Ferdinand I. retreats from Ofen, which is captured by the Sultan (August 26th)	124
	Alarm aroused by this in Vienna and Rome	125
	Charles V. determines to attack Algiers	125
	Paul III. arrives at Lucca on September the 8th and the Emperor on the 12th	126
	Conferences of the two heads of Christendom—subjects claiming their attention	127
	Milan, the religious affairs of Germany and the Catholic League	128
	Charles V. sails from Spezia to attack Algiers (September 28th)	129
	Total failure of the campaign (October 24th)	130
	The Pope begins to make preparations for the Council Contarini and Aleander to make proposals regarding time and place	131
	Mantua proposed as the place of meeting	132
	Attitude of Francis I.—opinions as to the place vary widely, Trent strongly recommended	133

A. D.		PAGE
1542	Mission of Morone to Germany	134
	His unceasing activity	135
	Announces the Pope's determination to summon the Council	136
	His arrival at Spires (September 8th), and the opening of the Diet	137
	His interview with, and remarks to, King Ferdinand .	138
	Morone receives permission to lay his instructions before the Diet, and states that the Pope would be glad to summon the Council to Trent (March)	139
	And proposes August the 15th as date of opening .	140
	The Protestants at once raise a protest	140
	Cambrai is then proposed	141
	Attitude of Ferdinand towards the demands of the Protestant Estates	142
	The Diet and the Turkish war—worthlessness of the troops raised	143
	Utter failure of the attack on Ofen	144
	The Pope finally decides to summon the Council to Trent (April–May)	144
	The Bull to this effect (dated May 22nd) is promul- gated	145
	Francis I. meets it with a flat refusal	145
	The Protestants renew their protest and the Emperor also is unfavourable	146
	Efforts of Paul III. to promote peace between Charles and Francis	147
	But war breaks out between the two monarchs (July)	148
	The Pope appoints Legates to the Emperor and the King of France	149
	The Papal neutrality unbearable to Charles V.	150
	His embittered letter to the Pope (August 25th) in reply to the conciliar Bull	150
	But Paul III. will not be moved to depart from his neutral attitude	152
	Preparations commenced at Trent for the Council .	153
	Three conciliar Legates nominated (October 16th) .	154
	Continued opposition of the Emperor and the King of France	155
	The Pope decides (November 10th) to address a brief to both monarchs	156
	The Legates arrive at Trent, but very few prelates .	157
	Ferdinand expresses his delight at the beginning of the Council and the Emperor nominates orators .	158
1543	Granvelle and his companions arrive at Trent (January 7th)	159

A.D.		PAGE
1543	And appear before the Legates (January 9th)	160
	Suspicious proceedings of Granvelle	161
	The Italian bishops urged to a speedy attendance at the Council (January)	162
	Truchsess sent to the Diet at Nuremberg; he com- plains of the neglect shown by the German bishops (February)	163
	And has interviews with King Ferdinand, Granvelle, and the Bishop of Augsburg	164
	Who on the whole confine themselves to empty promises	165
	At last a few more bishops arrive at Trent	166
	Small attendance owing to the conduct of the Emperor and the French King	168

CHAPTER IV.

THE MEETING BETWEEN PAUL III. AND CHARLES V. AT BUSSETO.
—SUSPENSION OF THE COUNCIL.—THE POPE'S NEUTRALITY
AND EXERTIONS FOR PEACE.—MISUNDERSTANDINGS WITH
THE EMPEROR.

1543	Paul III. leaves Rome (February 26th) and arrives at Bologna (March 17th)	169
	Discussion in consistory (May 11th) on the postpone- ment of the Council	170
	Granvelle and Morone discuss this question at Trent	171
	Charles V. lands at Savona (May 24th) and is invited to a conference with the Pope	172
	Difficulties caused by the Emperor—the Pope leaves Bologna on June the 11th	173
	And reaches Busseto on the 21st	174
	Negotiations with the Emperor	175
	The Milanese question again a difficulty	176
	Charles V. makes an emphatic speech before the Sacred College (June 24th)	177
	No agreement come to on the conciliar question	178
	Discussions at Trent on the question of a translation or suspension of the Council	179
	A suspension is decided upon in consistory of July the 6th	181
	And permission given to the prelates to leave Trent	181
	Renewed tension between the Pope and Charles V.	182
	Tactful attitude of Francis I.	183

A. D.		PAGE
1543	The Emperor enters into an alliance with Henry VIII.	184
	The Pope will not move from his neutrality, and sends (November) Cardinal Farnese to Charles and Francis	185
	Altercation between the Pope and the Cardinal of Burgos (December 19th)	186
1544	Farnese goes first to France and then to the Emperor, with whom he enters Worms on January the 23rd	187
	Painful interview of Farnese with Charles V.	188
	Total failure of the mission—Farnese leaves Worms.	189
	Resolutions of the Diet at Spire—concessions to the Protestants (June–July)	190
	Result of Farnese's mission to France	191
	Exasperation of the Imperialist party in Rome	192
	Undisturbed calm of Cardinal Farnese	193
	Cardinal d'Este arrives in Rome (June 9th) as ambas- sador from France	193
	The Pope still clings to his policy of neutrality	194
	Measures taken in consistory (July 30th) with respect to the Recess of Spire	195
	Brief of remonstrance addressed to Charles V. (August 24th)	196
	Who refuses to receive the Legate	198
	The peace of Crespy between Charles and Francis (September)	199
	Charles V. feels that in the Recess he had agreed to more "than he could be responsible for"	200
	His statesmanship—renewal of diplomatic relations with the Pope (November)	201
	The nomination of Cardinals on December the 19th .	202

CHAPTER V.

SPREAD OF THE GERMAN SCHISM.—CARDINAL FARNESE'S MISSION TO WORMS.—NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN PAUL III. AND CHARLES V. AGAINST THE PROTESTANTS.—INVESTITURE OF PIER LUIGI FARNESE WITH PARMA AND PIACENZA.—THE CONVENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

1541	Spread of the authority of the Schmalkaldic League .	204
1542	Apostasy of the Archbishop of Cologne in opposition to his cathedral chapter	205
1543	Overthrow by the Emperor of the Duke of Cleves (September)	206

A.D.		PAGE
1544	Results of this victory—the secret clauses of the peace of Crespy	207
	Nuncios sent to the Emperor and the King of France about the holding of the Council (October)	208
	Removal of the suspension of the Council (November 19th), which is summoned for March the 15th, 1545	209
1545	Conciliar Legates appointed (February 6th)	210
	Their powers—entry into Trent (March 13th)	211
	Not many prelates arrive	212
	Tortuous policy of the Emperor regarding the Council	213
	Violent pamphlet by Luther (March)	215
	The "Scholia" of Calvin and addresses of Sleidan	216
	Difficulties of the situation	217
	Mission of Cardinal Farnese	218
	Who arrives at Trent on April the 25th	219
	Delay in opening the Council	219
	Anxieties of Farnese's journey	220
	His experiences in traversing Protestant states	221
	He arrives at Worms on May 17th and has an audience of the Emperor	222
	Evasive answers of Charles V. and Granvelle	223
	The proposal to use armed force against the Protestants	224
	Opinion of the nuncios about this plan	224
	Farnese returns (May 28th) to Rome to bring the compact between the Pope and Charles V. to a conclusion	225
	Paul III. is prepared to give extensive help	225
	And orders preparations to be made for war	226
	Difficulties spring up and the undertaking is postponed	227
	Andelot's announcement about the Council and the war	228
	Painful surprise of the Pope	228
	The plan of conferring Parma and Piacenza upon Pier Luigi Farnese	229
	Opposition of the Emperor and some of the Cardinals	230
	But Pier Luigi is invested with these cities (August 26th)	232
	Opinions of Cardinals Gonzaga and Carafa	233
	The Pope's proposals to the Emperor about the Council (September 13th)	235
	Interviews of the nuncios with Charles V. (October)	236
	Decision in consistory to open the Council	237
	The Schmalkaldic League capture Duke Henry of Brunswick	238

A.D.		PAGE
1545	Brief for the opening of the Council sent to the Legates (December 7th)	238

CHAPTER VI.

TRANSACTIONS AND DECREES OF THE FIVE FIRST SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (DECEMBER 1545 TO JUNE 1546).

1545	The Council solemnly opened on December the 13th	240
	Principal members of the Council present	242
	The important question "dogma or reform first" at the first Congregation—suggestion by the French prelates	244
1546	Discussions on procedure and on the title of the Council	245
	Election of the conciliar officials (January)	247
	Impressive exhortation from the Legates read at the second session (January 7th)	248
	Renewed discussion on the title of the Council	249
	The Pope wishes decisions on dogma to precede measures of reform	—
	Resistance to this from the Imperialists	251
	It is decided to deal with both questions simultaneously	252
	But matters of faith to be considered of primary importance	254
	Attitude of the Protestants. Death of Luther (February 18th)	256
	Charles V. and the Protestants	257
	Intrusion of the Imperial policy into the procedure of the Council (April)	258
	Discussion and decrees on the canon of Holy Scripture (April 8th)	259
	The Council at work—the Bull "Superni dispositione"	261
	Discussion on the reform of the Episcopate and the Dataria	263
	Approbation of decrees published at the fourth session	264
	Debate on reform of the pulpit (May)	265
	And on original sin and the Immaculate Conception	266
	Dogmatic decree on these subjects (June)	267
	Decrees on reform	268
	The Emperor wishes dogmatic decrees to be omitted	269
	Ambassadors from France arrive at Trent (June 26th)	270
	"Justification" to be discussed in the sixth session	271
	Unforeseen difficulties suddenly arise	271

CHAPTER VII.

THE PAPAL-IMPERIAL LEAGUE OF JUNE 1546.—THE
SCHMALKALDIC WAR.

A.D.		PAGE
	Growing organization of the Schmalkaldic League	272
	Stubborn refusal of the Protestants to attend the Council	273
1545	The Emperor proposes an offensive alliance with the Pope against the Protestants	273
	Difficulties in drawing up the articles of this alliance	274
	Anxiety of the Emperor at the aggressions of the Protestants	275
	Protracted negotiations with the Pope (December)	276
	Various tendencies at the Imperial court	277
1546	Charles V. allows (January 27th) another religious conference to begin at Ratisbon	278
	Attitude of the Protestants towards this	279
	Proceedings at the conference—the speeches on both sides	280
	The Protestants recall their representatives (March 20th) and publish two memoirs against the Council	281
	Charles V. arrives at Ratisbon (April 10th)	282
	He is suspected of playing a double game	282
	The instructions of his envoy to Rome—irritation of the Pope	283
	Perverse schemes of Cardinal Accolti	284
	The quarrel between Rome and Florence	285
	Despite the appearances to the contrary, the Emperor really wishes for war against the Protestants	286
	The negotiations at Ratisbon (May)	287
	The treaty signed (June)	288
	Conditions of the alliance	289
	It is sent to Rome for the Pope's ratification (June)	290
	Opposition by some of the Cardinals—the treaty signed by Paul III. on June the 26th	291
	The Emperor's description of the situation	292
	His tactics—incapacity of the Schmalkaldic League	293
	Operations of the leaders of the League	294
	Lack of unity among the Protestants	295
	Arrival of the Papal troops in Germany (August)	296
	Extreme caution of Charles V.	297
	Break up of the Schmalkaldic forces and their retreat (November)	298
	Charles V.'s belief in toleration leads to breaches of amity with the Holy See	299

CHAPTER VIII.

DISSENSIONS BETWEEN PAUL III. AND CHARLES V.

A.D.		PAGE
1546	Barriers to a permanent understanding between the Pope and the Emperor	300
	Complaints of Charles V.	301
	The Pope's distrust is not unjustified. Cardinal Farnese's audience with the Emperor (August 24th)	302
	Disappointment of the Pope and of the Farnese family	303
	The Fathers at Trent fear an attack from the Protestant troops	304
	But the Pope will not allow the sessions to be suspended (July)	305
	The proposal for a removal of the Council	306
	Excited discussion on this at Trent (July 28th)	307
	Violent outburst of the Imperialist prelates	308
	Irritation of the Emperor at the proposal (August)	309
	The Bull authorizing a translation of the Council if necessary	310
	In the meanwhile the Council to continue its labours	310
	Indignation of the Pope at the attitude of Charles V.	311
	Fresh instructions sent to the Legates (August 17th)	312
	Futility of the negotiations	313
	Remarks of the Pope to the ambassador Vega (September)	314
	Difficulties of the question of the translation	315
	The proposition that the Pope should suspend the Council (October 9th)	316
	The matter to be left to the Council's own decision	317
	Reply of the Legates on the question (October 25th)	318
	Declaration of Charles V. in his instructions to Mendoza	319
	Effect of the Spanish supremacy in Italy	320
	The Gonzaga and Pier Luigi Farnese—conflict between Papal and Imperial interests	321
	Altercation between the nuncio Verallo and Granvelle (November 12th)	322
	The Pope deeply hurt, but still desires peace	323
	The danger of his being drawn into the strife between Charles V. and Francis I.	324
	What had been gained by the great sacrifices made by Paul III. ?	325
	Violations by the Imperialists of the treaty with the Pope	326

A.D.		PAGE
1546	Disloyal agreement with the Protestant Estates	327
	The Pope determines to refuse the renewal of the treaty	328
1547	Brief to the Emperor (January 22nd) announcing the recall of the Papal forces	328
	Verallo's audience with the Emperor (February 2nd)	330
	Anger and violent behaviour of Charles V.	331
	Calculated purpose of his threats	332
	Firmness and dignity of the Pope	333
	Aim of the French policy	333
	Design of Ferrante Gonzaga	334
	Death of Henry VIII. (January 28th), and project of the Pope for the recovery of England	335
	Renewed anger of Charles V.	336
	Unexpected measure of the translation of the Council from Trent	336

CHAPTER IX.

PROGRESS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.—ITS REMOVAL TO BOLOGNA.—THE SCHMALKALDIC WARS END IN VICTORY FOR THE EMPEROR.—ASSASSINATION OF PIER LUIGI FARNESE.

1546	Cardinal Farnese endeavours to bring about an agreement between the Papal and Imperialist interests in the Council (November)	337
	Points upon which an agreement is reached	337
	But Charles V. refuses this (December)	339
1547	The sixth solemn session (January 13th)—its importance	340
	Discussion of the decree of justification	341
	Conferences of theologians on the subject	343
	Publication of the decree—its contents	344
	Satisfaction of the Pope. Rejoinder to the Imperial policy (January 30th) received by Mendoza	347
	Seventh session—discussion and decree on the Sacraments	348
	The reform decree (February 26th–28th)	349
	Outbreak of an epidemic in Trent	351
	Discussion on the suspension or translation of the Council	352
	Decision (March 11th) in favour of translation to Bologna	353
	On the following day the majority of the Fathers leave Trent	354

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xix

A.D.		PAGE
1547	The Pope gives his consent to the translation (March 25th)	355
	Charles V. expresses his extreme displeasure	356
	Declaration by Paul III. to the Imperial ambassador	357
	The Emperor takes the field against the Elector of Saxony (April)—angry remarks to the nuncio Verallo	358
	The Elector defeated at Mühlberg and taken prisoner	359
	This is followed (June 19th) by the submission of Philip of Hesse.	360
	Efforts of Cardinal Farnese to compose the differences between the Pope and the Emperor	361
	The mission of Cardinal Sfondrato, who meets the Emperor on July the 4th	363
	All the Legate's proposals are refused. Charles V.'s continued discourtesy	365
	Memorial sent by Sfondrato to Rome (July 31st)	365
	Where his behaviour is strongly criticised	366
	Determination of the Pope that the Council must remain free	367
	But consents to a postponement of the next session, fixed for September 15th	368
	Italian policy of Charles V. Plan of Gonzaga to over- throw Pier Luigi Farnese	369
	Conditions of the duchy of Parma-Piacenza	370
	Ferrante Gonzaga's plot against Pier Luigi	371
	Who is assassinated at Piacenza on September the 10th	372
	Deeply as the Pope feels this calamity, he does not lose his composure	373
	And sends Cardinal Cervini (September 13th) to Piacenza	374

CHAPTER X.

THE EMPEROR IN OPPOSITION TO THE POPE AND THE
AUTHORITY OF THE COUNCIL.

1547	The Emperor's conception of religious unity—his claims	375
	Unworthy behaviour of the Imperialists towards the Pope and Cardinal Sfondrato (September)	376
	The Legate's interview with Charles V. and with Granvelle	377
	The Emperor and Ottavio Farnese	378
	Colourless replies of the Emperor to the Legate	380

A.D.		PAGE
1547	No steps are taken to punish the murderers of Pier Luigi	381
	Firmness of the Pope and dignity of his conduct	381
	His address in consistory on the murder	382
	Troops collected together in Rome	383
	Negotiations for an alliance between France and the Pope	384
	Rumours of an attack on Rome—the Pope looks on all sides for support (November)	385
	Negotiations with Genoa, Venice, and France	386
	Charles V. opens the Diet at Augsburg (September 1st)	386
	The situation in Germany	387
	Difficulties by which Charles V. is confronted	388
	The affairs of religion in the Diet—division of opinions	389
	The Imperial "resolution" of October the 18th	390
	The representatives of the towns oppose the Emperor	392
	The conciliar question in the Diet	393
	Efforts to browbeat the Pope into subjection to the Emperor's will. Cardinal Madruzzo sent to Rome (November)	394
	His interview with the Pope	395
	Who consults various Cardinals	396
	The opinion of the Fathers at Bologna to be taken before a final decision is given	397
	The conditions laid down by the Council at Bologna	398
	Charles V. expects Pope and Council to bend before his will	400
1548	The Imperial agents appear at the Council (January 16th)	401
	The Emperor's protest is presented to the Council	402
	Rejoinder of the Cardinal-President	403
	Declaration by Mendoza to the Pope in consistory (January 23rd)	404
	Proposals of the Legates at Bologna	405
	Dignified reply of the Pope to Mendoza (February 1st)	406
	The Emperor shrinks from the extreme step	408

CHAPTER XI.

THE INTERIM.—LAST DAYS OF PAUL III.—HIS DEATH.

1548	The long-cherished plan of the Emperor	409
	His new expedient	411
	Astonishment of the Cardinal-Legate, Sfondrato	412
	Charles V. conscious of the risks he was running	412

A.D.		PAGE
1548	The "Interim," or "Declaration . . . on the observance of religion . . . until the decision of the General Council"	413
	Private negotiations of the Emperor with each Estate in the Diet	415
	Opposition of the Catholic Estates to the Interim	416
	Concession made to them by the Emperor	417
	The Imperialist pretensions	418
	Sfondrato and the Interim	419
	Endeavours to drive the Pope into the arms of Henry II. Charles V. and the nuncio Santa Croce	420 421
	The Emperor tries to make the Interim acceptable to the Catholic Princes	422
	But it meets with growing dislike	423
	Charles V.'s scheme of reform for the Catholic clergy	424
	He takes steps to prevent a combination of the discontented spirits	425
	To outward appearance the Emperor succeeds	426
	Varied acceptance of the Interim	427
	Agitation of the Protestants against the "papistical" Interim	428
	Reception of the Interim by Paul III. (May)	429
	Should the Council be again transferred?	431
	Mission of Dandino to France (June)	432
	And of Pietro Bertano to Charles V.	433
	Bertano and Sfondrato received in audience by the Emperor (July 2nd)	434
	New dissensions between the Pope and the Emperor	435
	French mission to restrain the Pope from making concessions to Charles V.	435
	Three Legates appointed for Germany (August 31st)	436
	Uselessness of the Interim. Anxiety of Charles V.	437
	The decrees of the Diet quite ineffectual	438
1549	Reception of the Legates by the Emperor (January 3rd)	439
	The Pope endeavours to satisfy Charles V.	440
	Who still continues unconciliatory	441
	The missions of Giulio Orsini about Piacenza	442
	Nomination of new Cardinals on April the 8th	443
	Reply of the Emperor to the demand for Piacenza (June 12th)	443
	Astonishment and alarm in Rome	444
	Paul III.'s letter to the Emperor	445
	Again the project of a Franco-Papal alliance	446
	Impossible conditions laid down by Charles V.	447
	Invitation to Rome of bishops from Bologna and Trent	448

A.D.		PAGE
1549	The French alliance and Ottavio Farnese	449
	Ottavio leaves Rome secretly for Parma (October 20th).	
	Anger of the Pope	450
	Who is attacked by a violent fever	451
	Death of Paul III. on November the 10th	453
	His burial in St. Peter's. The monument erected to him	453

CHAPTER XII.

THE COMPLETION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION IN
ENGLAND AND SCANDINAVIA.—THE PROTESTANT PROPAGA-
GANDA IN FRANCE.

	State of religious affairs in England since 1533	456
	Terrors of the new statutes	457
1535	Execution of More, Fisher, and others	458
	Indignation throughout Europe	459
	Anger of the Pope. Bull against Henry VIII. (August)	460
	But Charles V. and Francis I. will not interfere.	461
	Division of opinion in the Sacred College (November)	462
1536	Death of Queen Catherine, and execution of Anne Boleyn	463
	Dissolution of the monasteries	464
	Catholic rising in the north of England. Paul III. contemplates sending Pole to Henry VIII.	465
1537	And sets great hopes on this mission	466
	Which is, however, a failure. Reasons for this.	467
1538	The Pope determines on the publication of the Bull against Henry VIII. (December 17th),	468
	Pole quite unsuccessful in his mission to the Emperor and Francis I.	469
1541	Execution of his mother (May 27th). The confiscated monastic property	470
	The obstacles to Henry's reconciliation	471
1542	The situation in Scotland. Death of James V.	471
1543	Cardinal Beaton. Mission of Grimani	472
1546	Murder of Cardinal Beaton (May 29th)	473
1547	Death of Henry VIII. (January 28th). Action by the Pope	474
	Doctrinal standpoint of Henry VIII.	475
	Protestantism of Cranmer and Somerset	476
1542	Spread of heresy in Sweden. Revolt of the peasants Quelled by Gustavus Wasa	477 478

A.D.		PAGE
1536	State of the Catholic cause in Denmark. Arrest of the bishops	479
1537	Construction of a new Church system	479
	Inglorious end of the Catholic episcopate. Gradual extirpation of the Faith	480
	Lutheranism established in Norway and Iceland	481
	The heretical movement in France	482
1535	Declaration of Francis I. (January 29th)	483
	His double game. Edict against the Protestants (July)	484
1540	And another, "The Edict of Fontainebleau" (June 1st)	485
	Severity dealt out to the French Protestants. The Waldensians	486
	Calvin's work, <i>Handbook of Christian Doctrine</i>	487

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PROTESTANT PROPAGANDA IN POLAND AND ITALY.—FOUNDATION OF THE ROMAN INQUISITION.—THE POPE'S SUPPORT OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS OUTSIDE EUROPE, AND HIS ACTIVITY IN OTHER SPHERES OF WORK.

	Spread of Lutheranism in Poland	488
	Causes of the failure to expel heresy from the kingdom	489
	The political situation compels the King to turn to the bishops	490
	Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Ermeland	490
	Protestant propaganda in Italy. Renée, duchess of Ferrara	491
	Clemency of Paul III. to those who recant	492
	Surreptitious character of the Protestant propaganda	493
	In Venetian territory, Lucca, Modena, and Siena	494
	Juan Valdes in Naples, 1532-1541	495
	Character of his teaching. The "Spirituali"	496
	Valdes and his circle. Pietro Martire Vermigli	497
1541	His sermons at Lucca	498
1542	He flies from Lucca, and with Ochino leaves Italy	500
	Spread of Lutheran opinions at Modena	501
	The "Accademia" a focus of religious rebellion	502
	Action by Morone and Contarini	503
	Six Cardinals appointed (July 4th) as Inquisitors-General	503
	The Roman Inquisition	505
1547-49	Attitude of the Italian States towards the Inquisition	509

A.D.	PAGE
	Especially of Naples, Milan, and Venice 510
1549	Apostasy of Pietro Paolo Vergerio 511
	Measures to extirpate Lutheran errors, but precipitate zeal is little to the liking of Paul III. 512
	An index of forbidden books published 513
	Paul III. and the foreign missions 513
1534-38	In Ethiopia and the Congo 514
1534-47	Missions in America; foundation of new sees 515
	The East Indies. The bishopric of Goa 517
1543	The American Indians. Bartolomé de las Casas 518
	The Pope forbids the slavery of the Indians 519
	His interest in the Armenians and Maronites 520
	Processes of canonization during the pontificate 521
1549	Preparations for a General Jubilee 522

CHAPTER XIV.

PAUL III. AS THE PATRON OF LEARNING AND ART.

The Pope, during his cardinalate, a warm friend to men of learning	523
At his accession the Renaissance had passed its zenith	524
Duality of the character of Paul III.'s patronage of letters	525
His first undertaking is the restoration of the Roman University. His steps to obtain good professors	526
Success of the undertaking	527
Lectures in medicine—teachers of rhetoric	528
Care bestowed by Paul III. in the education of his relatives	529
Support extended to men of learning by the Farnesi	530
Theologians and canonists more in favour with the Pope than poets	531
Poets associated with the reign of Paul III.	532
The academies and the popularity of satire	534
Pietro Aretino and Niccolò Franco	535
Paolo Giovio. The physician, Fracastoro, and others	536
The classical scholar, Manetti	537
Giovanni Guidiccioni—Blosius Palladius	538
Canonists and theologians encouraged by Paul III.	540
Eminent Cardinals created during the pontificate	541
Paul III. and Erasmus	542
Theologians called to Rome in view of the Council	543

A.D.		PAGE
1549	Great influence of Spanish divines	544
	Paul III. and the Vatican Library	545
	Orders search to be made for rare manuscripts	547
	Increased importance of the custodian of the Library	547
	Many works of this period are dedicated to Paul III.	548
	Copernicus and Paul III.	549
	"The last great Pope of the Renaissance"	550
	Paul III. reassembles in Rome the great artists of the Medicean era	551
	His support and employment of Michael Angelo	552
	And of Peruzzi and Antonio da Sangallo	554
	The work of repairing and renewing the fortifications of Rome	555
	Sangallo's plan for the new defences	556
	Numerous architects and engineers employed to carry these out	557
	Description of the works	558
	Fortification of the Leonine city	560
	Paul III. appoints L. G. Manetti to take charge of the antiquities of Rome	563
	Notwithstanding this, acts of destruction are still continued	565
	Betterment of the conditions of the Roman streets	566
	Construction of new thoroughfares	567
	Reconstruction of the Capitol	569
	Magnificence of Michael Angelo's plan for this work	572
	Extensive restorations and embellishments in the Vatican	573
	The Cappella Paolina and the Sala Regia	574
	Decorative work in the castle of St. Angelo	575
1535-46	Construction of the Farnese palace	579
1546	And that of S. Marco	583
1544	Restoration of various churches	585
	And of fortifications of towns in the States of the Church	586
1540-43	The new fortress of Perugia	587
	Embellishment of Orvieto	588
	Work at Viterbo and Frascati	589
	And other works of general utility	590
	Construction of the "Cava Paolina"	591
	Buildings by Pier Luigi Farnese at Nepi and Caprarola	592
	Work of Vignola at Castro, the Vatican, and Bologna	593
	Place held by sculpture under Paul III.	594
	Almost all the sculptors employed are Tuscans	594
	Renown of and homage paid to Michael Angelo	595

A.D.	PAGE
	The minor arts and handicrafts 596
	But few relics of these are now in Rome 597
	Coins and medals of Paul III. 598
	Benvenuto Cellini and Leone Leoni 599
	Cesati, Marmitta, Belli, and Cherubino 600
	Work executed by Perino del Vaga 601
	The "Congregazione Ponteficia dei Virtuosi al Pantheon" 601
	Visits of Titian to Rome in 1543 and 1545. Daniele da Volterra 603
	Frescoes by Vasari at the Cancelleria 604
	And by del Vaga and others. The illuminators, Raimondi and Clovio. Work by Pastorino 608
1536	Michael Angelo begins the fresco of The Last Judg- ment in the Sixtine Chapel (April-May) 609
1541	Which is finished and solemnly uncovered on the eve of All Saints 612
	Extraordinary impression made by the fresco 612
	But it also meets with criticism 614
	Invectives of Aretino 615
	And censure by Lodovico Dolce and others 617
	Decision of the Congregation of the Council of January the 21st, 1546, on pictures. This is carried out by Daniele da Volterra 618
	Repeated repainting of parts of the fresco 619
	Composition and design of the fresco 621
	Influence of Dante upon the genius of Michael Angelo 627
	And his deviation from conventional usage 629
	Michael Angelo undertakes the decoration of the Cappella Paolina 631
	Subjects of the frescoes in the chapel 633
	The monument to Julius II. at last terminated 634
	The last great work of Michael Angelo: the rebuilding of St. Peter's 635
1535-44	Measures taken by the Pope to raise the necessary funds 636
1544	Discovery of the sarcophagus of Maria, wife of Honorius 638
	The plan and model by Sangallo of the new building 639
	Michael Angelo's criticism of this 640
1546	On the death of Sangallo, Michael Angelo is ap- pointed 641
	And Paul III. grants him unrestricted powers 642
	Attacks on Michael Angelo by the partisans of Sangallo 643

A.D.		PAGE
1549	<i>Motu proprio</i> by the Pope in support of Michael Angelo	644
	Who makes the fullest use of the freedom guaranteed to him	645
	And makes a model of his plan	646
	The dome of St. Peter's	647
	Importance of the Pope's share in the work done by Michael Angelo	648

LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
IN APPENDIX.

	PAGE
I. Pope Paul III. to Baldassare Peruzzi . . .	651
II. " " to Antonio da Sangallo . . .	652
III. " " to Francis I., King of France . . .	653
IV. List of churches demolished in Rome for the Emperor's visit	654
V. Pope Paul III. to Antonio da Sangallo . . .	655
VI. " " grants to the " Fabbrica " of St. Peter's the river Anio	655
VII. Giovanni dell' Antella to Cosimo I., Duke of Florence	658
VIII. Cardinal Aleander to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese	659
IX. Nino Sernini to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	659
X. " " " " " "	660
XI. Giovanni Ricci to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese	661
XII. Nino Sernini to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	661
XIII. Pope Paul III. to Francis I., King of France . .	662
XIV. Nino Sernini to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	662
XV. Averrardo Serristori to Cosimo I., Duke of Florence	663
XVI. Lattanzio Tolomei to Siena	663
XVII. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese to Giovanni Poggio	664
XVIII. Nino Sernini to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	665
XIX. " " " " " "	665
XX. Instruction for Dionysius, Guardian of the convent of Sion in Jerusalem, as Visitor of the Maronites of Lebanon	666
XXI. Instruction for M. Grimani, Patriarch of Aquila, as nuncio in Scotland	668
XXII. Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga to Ferrante Gonzaga	670
XXIII. " " to Monsignor de Rossi	672

xxx LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS IN APPENDIX.

	PAGE
XXIV. Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga to the Duke of Ferrara	672
XXV. " " " "	673
XXVI. " " " "	673
XXVII. " " " "	674
XXVIII. " " " "	674
XXIX. " " " "	675
XXX. Cardinal Farnese to Cardinal Morone . . .	676
XXXI. Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga to Camillo Capilupi .	677
XXXII. " " to Ferrante Gonzaga .	677
XXXIII. Girolamo Tiranno to Urbino	677
XXXIV. Pope Paul III. to King Ferdinand I.	678
XXXV. Cardinal Morone to Cardinal Madruzzo	679
XXXVI. Pope Paul III. to Antonino Sirleto	680
XXXVII. A. Cattaneo to Cardinal Madruzzo	681
XXXVIII. Benedetto Buonanni to Cosimo I., Duke of Tuscany	681
XXXIX. Uberto Strozzi to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga . . .	682
XL. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese to Camillo Orsini	683

CHAPTER I.

IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA AND THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

AT the very moment when the Church in Italy was assuming daily a more and more mundane character, and the corrupt elements of the Renaissance were, in the person of the Spaniard Alexander VI., degrading the Holy See, a man was born in Spain who was destined to contribute more powerfully than any other, by the force and the unequalled range of his activity, to purify the Church and to restore by means of new conquests the balance of her recent losses. This was Ignatius of Loyola.¹

¹ The chief sources for Loyola's life and works, besides the "Spiritual Exercises" and the "Constitutions of the Society of Jesus," which will be discussed more fully in the text, are (1) his letters, *Cartas de San Ignacio de Loyola*, in six volumes, published in Madrid, 1874-1889, by Spanish Jesuits. Since 1903 there has appeared (already about thirty volumes) in the great authoritative *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*, also published at Madrid under the editorship of Spanish Jesuits, a new critical edition which will furnish as many letters again: *Monumenta Ignatiana*, Ser. I., Matriti, 1903 *seqq.* (on two letters falsely ascribed to Ignatius, see HEITZ in the Rev. d'Hist. Eccles., IX., 47 *seq.*, 506). (2) The "Autobiography" or "Confessions." On the solicitation of his disciples Ignatius († 1556) related between 1553 and 1555 some of his experiences to P. Luis Gonsalvez de Camara, who in the course of the narration made short notes and afterwards dictated all he had heard in full, in Spanish and Italian, to his amanuensis. These memoranda appeared in a Latin translation in the *Acta Sanctorum, Julii, VII.* (Antwerpiae, 1731), and, as a separate work, *Acta quaedam S. P. Ignatii a LUDOVICO VOL. XII.*

The Loyola family belonged to the lesser nobility of the beautiful Basque country. There, in the province of Guipuzcoa, hidden away among mountain solitudes to the west of the little town of Azpeitia on the road to Azcoitia, stood the cradle of the race, which differed in no respects from the other seats of Basque noblemen. The small

CONSALVO excerpta, in Paris, 1873, in the original tongue in the Monumenta Ignatiana, Ser. IV., t. I (Matriti, 1904). The authenticity and value of this source has recently been pointed out by JOSEPH ŠUSTA (Ignatius von Loyolas Selbstbiographie: Eine quellen-geschichtliche Studie) in the Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung, XXVI. (1905), 86-106. (3) The Portuguese *Memoriale* or *Diarium* of P. Gonsalvez. This is founded on the notes which Gonsalvez took down in Rome day by day from June to October 1555 from the answers given to his questions by Ignatius, especially concerning private occurrences. In 1573 Gonsalvez put all his notes into order and added explanatory remarks; the first copy is in the already named volume of the Monumenta. (4) A more important account of Ignatius's life from 1521 to 1547, by the Spaniard Diego Laynez, one of his first nine associates and his immediate successor in the Generalship, written in Spanish in the form of a letter in 1547; published for the first time in 1904 in the same volume of the Monumenta. (5) *De Vita P. Ignatii et Societatis Jesu initiis*. The Spaniard, Juan de Polanco, who as Secretary of the Order was the founder's right-hand man from 1547 up to the death of the latter, drew up, but in the last years of his life (+1577), from the numerous letters and reports he had received and from his own recollections, a *Chronicon Societatis Jesu*, to serve as a deposit of material for the future historian, and afterwards set to work at a life of Ignatius extending to the year 1543 but practically only to 1539; both first published in the Monumenta Historica (Matriti, 1894-1898, 6 vols.); cf. Anal. Bolland., XXVI., 487 seq. (6) *Vita Ignatii Loiolae, Societatis Jesu Fundatoris*, written by the Spaniard, Pedro de Ribadeneira, at the command of Francis Borgia, General of the Order, in Latin and also later in Spanish, and founded on his own observation, on the autobiography of the saint and that contained in the letter of Laynez, finally on the communications collected throughout the whole Order about 1567; first edition issued at Naples in 1572, that with

building with its thick walls is only two stories high; over the doorway can be seen in stone the armorial bearings of the house of Loyola. In this abode,¹ carefully preserved from decay by the pious regard of posterity, at the beginning of the ninetieth year of the 15th century,² Iñigo, who was later known as Ignatius,³ first saw the

important additions by the author himself at Madrid in 1583. (7) *De vita et moribus Ignatii Loyolae, qui Societatem Jesu fundavit*, Libri III., auctore JOANNE PETRO MAFFEIO, S.J. (Romae, 1585 and often since), in Ciceronian Latin, an intelligent use being made of the autobiography and other sources (*cf.* ŠUSTA, *loc. cit.*, 74). (8) *Historia Societatis Jesu prima pars*, auctore NICOLAO ORLANDINO, S.J. (Romae, 1615), describing the Generalship of Ignatius from Polanco's Chronicon and the letters made use of by the latter; carefully compared with the printed work of Ribadeneira and others who were intimate with the founder. Orlandino's skill is recognized by RANKE (*Päpste*, III., 10th ed., Leipzig, 1900, 114). (9) *Della Vita e dell' Istituto di S. Ignatio, Fondatore della Compagnia di Gesù. Libri cinque del P. DANIELO BARTOLI, S.J.* (Roma, 1650 and often), written in good Italian, with careful employment of his authorities, contains much that had been previously overlooked or purposely passed over (*cf.* *Acta Sanctorum*, Julii, VII., 598, and *Analecta Bollandiana*, XII. [1894], 70; XV. [1896], 450, 451). (10) The very copious *Commentarius praeuius* to the acts of Ignatius, composed by the Bollandist JOANNES PINIUS, S.J., in the same volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*. Various other sources will be referred to as occasion arises. For GOTHEIN'S criticism (*Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation*, Halle, 1895), *cf.* *Histor. Jahrb.*, XVII., 561-574, and *Anal. Bolland.*, XV, 449-454 (see also ŠUSTA, *loc. cit.*). For earlier and more modern biographies of the saint, see also HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der kathol. Kirche*, III., 2nd ed., Paderborn, 1908, 10-12.

¹ It is now enclosed in a wing of the vast Colegio de Loyola, of which the lofty-domed church was built by Fontana about 1683.

² It is an old controversy whether the birth-year was 1491 or 1495; for the literature on the subject, see *Analecta Bollandiana*, XIX., 468. Recently a plea has been put in for 1492 (Šusta, 95).

³ His baptismal saint was not St. Ignatius of Antioch, the disciple of the apostles, but a Spanish saint, the Benedictine Abbot, Iñigo

light of day. After a childhood passed in the lonely valley, he was taken while yet a lad under the protection of a friend of his family, Juan Velasquez, grand treasurer to Ferdinand the Catholic, who resided sometimes at Arevalo and sometimes at the King's court.¹ The boy's education did not pass the customary limits of that age; he learned to read and write, and after the death of Velasquez he entered military service under the Duke of Najera, viceroy of Navarre. He lived as a genuine child of the Spanish chivalry of those days, filled with the spirit of the Catholic faith, which that chivalry had defended in centuries of wars against the Moors. Always in readiness to deal a blow, rejoicing in the stress of battle, and noble of heart, he was in the rest of his conduct far from being a saint. Juan de Polanco, afterwards his companion of long years' standing, relates that in his youthful days Ignatius had been a gambler and had had amorous adventures.²

Then came a turning-point. Ignatius's life was to take a direction which should turn the hot head of the camp into a champion of the Church and the Holy See and the founder of a new Order.

(Enecho) of Oña. Up to 1537 he signed himself only Iñigo (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I, 99, 156, 246); from 1537 to 1543 alternately Iñigo and Ignacio; from 1543 onwards with one exception we meet only with Ignacio or Ignatius. He seems to have thought erroneously that this was synonymous with Iñigo (*cf.* ASTRAIN, I., 2, 3).

¹ FITA in Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia, XVII., Madrid, 1890, 492-520.

² Vita Ignatii Loiolae et rerum Societatis Jesu historia, I., Matriti, 1894, 10; *cf.* further evidence in ASTRAIN, I., 13 *seq.* See also the Process in the Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 580-597, which does not, however, establish whether the accusation there dealt with, of serious offence committed at night with previous intent and by cunning, was justified or not. It is also unknown whether a sentence was passed or not.

When the French were besieging Pampeluna in May 1521 Ignatius was determined to hold the fortress to the last extremity; nor did it yield before the valiant soldier had been severely wounded in the leg.¹ He was conveyed to his father's house, and there it was discovered that the limb had been badly set, and would have to be broken again. Ignatius bore the excruciating pain with no other sign of suffering than the hard clenching of his fists, but it was long before the limb was healed, and in order to while away the time the sick man asked for romances of chivalry. There were none such in the house, therefore he was given a Spanish *Lives of the Saints* and a translation in the same language of the great *Vita Christi* compiled by the Carthusian, Ludolph of Saxony, from the Gospels and patristic writings. Ignatius read and pondered the sacred story herein narrated. Still, fancies and thoughts of this world came back to him again. "For two, three, four hours," he relates, "he called before his mind the deeds of valour which he wished to perform in honour of a certain lady. She was not," he affirmed, "a lady of ordinary nobility, no Countess, no Duchess—she was one of still higher rank."² Yet there came hours of reading once more in the doings of the saints. "What," he asked himself, "if I were to do the deeds of a St. Dominic or a St. Francis?"

So his moods and plans varied. Thus he acquired this experience: mundane thoughts fascinated him, it was true, yet in the end they only left his soul parched and discontented; but when he purposed to himself to imitate the strenuous lives of the saints, he not only found comfort in such contemplations themselves, but afterwards felt satis-

¹ Autobiography, n. 1, 2 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 38).

² *Ibid*, n. 6 (pp. 40, 41). ŠUSTA (p. 81) makes the not altogether inconceivable suggestion that Ignatius means here a princess *in genere*, an imaginary and ideal personage.

faction and joy. He came gradually to fix his mind on this contrast, and perceived that in the one case he was moved by an evil spirit and in the other by a good.¹

Finally, the thoughts of religion prevailed. They took possession of his whole soul; he determined to be God's knight and not the world's. In order to strengthen this resolution he copied, as far as his strength permitted him, in ornamental letters, an extract from Ludolph's *Vita Christi* into an exercise book; even then, as Laynez² assures us, he had a special devotion for the mother of our Lord.

Cured at last, he broke away from his family, determined to emulate the great deeds of the saints. He made a pilgrimage to the great Catalonian shrine of Our Lady of Montserrat. There in the rugged mountain wilderness he withdrew, a prey to deep contrition, into seclusion with a Benedictine monk and during three days poured forth the penitential avowals of his past. On the night of the Annunciation he held a vigil after knightly fashion before the time-honoured miraculous picture of Our Lady in the conventual church. He wore a rough garment of penance—a cord round his loins and a pilgrim's staff in his hand; sword and dagger he hung up by the altar; his knightly apparel he bestowed on a beggar.³

In order to escape observation and remain in complete concealment he now bent his steps to the neighbouring small town of Manresa, where he was received into the

¹ Autobiography, n. 6-10 (pp. 40-42).

² Letter of P. Diego Laynez, S.J., on Ignatius, to Polanco, dat. Bologna, June 17, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 101).

³ Autobiography, n. 16-18 (pp. 46-48). The sword was afterwards placed in the Church of Nuestra Señora de Belén in Barcelona and is still there (see CREIXELL, 145-160). Recently, on insufficient grounds, its authenticity has been disputed, see *Revista Montserratina*, I. (1907), 120 *seq.*

hospital. In spiritual exercises he was as yet unversed; outward acts of penance seemed to him the one and only standard of holiness.¹ He led accordingly the most austere life, begged his bread, fasted all the week except on Sunday, and three times a day gave himself the discipline; every week he made his confession and received the sacrament of the altar; daily he attended Mass and vespers; every night he rose from his bed to pray and daily passed seven hours on his knees in prayer;² the principal scene of his prayers and penitential exercises was a cave near the city.³ No wonder that by the end of the year Ignatius was seriously ill. Pious women in the higher ranks of life tended him in their homes, but he determined to change his dwelling, and in clothing and living to approximate more nearly to the customary ways of men.⁴

For the first four months he felt an inward joy that was almost without a cloud, but then came bitterest anguish and conflicts of the soul. Once he resolved neither to eat nor drink again until he had found peace. He persevered for a whole week, and only the command of his confessor availed to make him take some nourishment at last. His director also calmed him when he wished again and again to confess sins already laid bare. Peace returned once more, and his heart rejoiced in God.⁵

Great illumination ensued. God treated him, as Ignatius himself expressed it, "exactly as a schoolmaster treats a

¹ Letter of Laynez (see *supra*, p. 6, n. 2).

² Autobiography, n. 19-23 (pp. 48-51); letter of Laynez, 102; ASTRAIN, 34.

³ Cueva Santa, above which afterwards the Church of St. Ignatius was built (*cf.* PINIUS, Comment. præv., n. 49-53; Acta Sanctorum, Julii, VII.; ASTRAIN, 33-34).

⁴ Autobiography, n. 32-34 (pp. 55, 56).

⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 20-25 (pp. 49-52); letter of Laynez, 103.

child whom he is teaching.”¹ He bestowed upon him the gift of contemplative prayer. Often, so he confidently stated at a later time, “he thought to himself that even if no Holy Scriptures had been given us to teach us the truths of faith he would nevertheless have determined to give up life itself for them, solely on account of what he had seen with the soul.”² To his bosom friend Laynez he said, in speaking of the days at Manresa, that once in the neighbourhood of the city he had learned more in the course of an hour than all the sages of the world could have taught him.³ It was by the river Cardoner; Ignatius had sat down on the brink and was gazing into the stream; ⁴ many of the things then made known to him swept across his vision at a later day when he came to found his Order.⁵ In this sense it may be said that Manresa was the birth-place of the Society of Jesus. But that Ignatius then knew clearly and certainly that he was to be the founder of such an Order is a subsequent tradition which does not admit of proof. As the most recent sources of information made public show, Ignatius and those in his confidence spoke in a very different fashion.⁶

While still at Manresa Ignatius led many to a change

¹ Autobiography, n. 27 (p. 53).

² *Ibid.*, n. 28-31 (pp. 53-55); letter of Laynez, 103-104.

³ Memoranda of P. Ribadeneira, *De Actis Patris Nostri Ignatii*, apparently previous to the first appearance of his Life of Ignatius and therefore prior to 1572 (see *supra*, p. 2, note; first published in the Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 337-393; see *ibid.*, n. 1).

⁴ Autobiography, n. 30, 31 (pp. 54, 55); BARTOLI (see *supra*, p. 3, note), I., I., n. 14.

⁵ So asserts P. Jeronimo Nadal, Loyola's right hand in Rome (*Epistolae P. Hieronymi Nadal*, IV., Matriti, 1905, 652). Cf. also P. Luis Gonsalvez in his *Memoriale* (see *supra*, p. 2, note), n. 137 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., p. 220).

⁶ See *infra*, p. 31 *seq.*

of life by giving them "spiritual exercises."¹ This was the origin of the little book written simply and intelligibly, with the utmost brevity and compression of style, which belongs to the most remarkable books of mankind—the Book of the Exercises,—not that it was written down at one stroke. Ignatius himself replied to the question of Gonsalvez: "The Pilgrim—so was Ignatius called in his self-confessions—observed in his soul now this, now that, and found it profitable; then, thought he, this might also be useful to others, and so wrote it down." Ignatius particularly gave it to be understood that the directions as to the choice of a vocation and as to the formation of resolutions in weighty matters belonged to the time of his serious illness at Loyola.² The rules concerning thinking in conformity with the mind of the Church (*ad sentiendum vere cum ecclesia*) were added years afterwards in France or Italy. But already in 1547 Laynez had declared that Ignatius had made the Exercises his first consideration from the early days in Manresa.³ Everything points to the probability that there also he wrote out their first draft.⁴

The Book of the Exercises calls for a closer examination. The contents are divided into four "weeks." Each week can be curtailed or lengthened at need. The indispensable foundation of the whole work is formed by the aim and end of man. "Man was created that he might praise God our Lord, show Him reverence, and serve Him, and by so

¹ POLANCUS, Vita, c. 3 (p. 25).

² Autobiography, n. 99 (L. 97).

³ Letter, 103.

⁴ RIBADENEIRA, Vita, I., 7, c. 8 (*cf. supra*, p. 2, note), in the edition Vita Ignatii Loiolae . . . a Petro Ribadeneira . . . conscripta, Ingolstadii, 1590, 30; ASTRAIN, 149; H. WATRIGANT, S.J., La Genèse des Exercices de St. Ignace de Loyola. Extrait des Études. Reproduction avec pièces et notes complémentaires, Amiens, 1897, 25-27.

doing save his soul. All other creatures upon earth were created for the sake of man and to help him to reach his goal. It therefore follows that man must use these creatures so far as they help him to this goal, and abstain from them so far as they hinder him from attaining it." If he does not thus act, he sins. The meditations of the first week awaken a horror of sin and a dread of its consequences. The soul cleanses herself by confession; she breaks her fetters, reaches the true freedom of the children of God, and presses on with all her strength to her Creator. For no man can there be any other way than the imitation of Christ, which for Ignatius was his life's ideal, one which he pursued with the sincerity and strength of will peculiar to him.

In the first meditation of the second week Christ appears as the God-sent heavenly King; He must rule over all hearts, and therefore extend His sway over the whole world; He calls upon all to enlist in His army, and places Himself at the head of His loyal troops. All true souls cleave to Him closely. Following the steps of the Evangelists, the meditations now accompany the Saviour through all the passages of his life, with frequent prayers to the Heavenly Father that grace may be given to know and to love the Redeemer more, and to be more faithful to His example.¹ Here the right moment has arrived to make a choice of vocation. The Exercises offer a wise and searching introduction to the treatment of this momentous question; at the same time they serve as the pole-star for any important decision in life, whether such be made in the Exercises or in the world without. Now, in the Exercises, all, whom a choice of vocation no longer concerns, must in their several stations "reform themselves."

¹ Second week, first day, first and second meditation; third prelude, fifth meditation.

Ignatius makes it perfectly clear that this is a question not merely for priests and religious, but those also whom God calls to wedlock, to power, and to riches.

Every man in his calling and position must, by living faith and practical love, participate in the work of Christ's kingdom. That is the ultimate goal of the Exercises. In order to attain to it the meditation on the two standards (*duæ vexillæ*), that of Lucifer and that of Christ, shows us with complete perspicuity the contrast between the ruinous principles of the evil spirit and the principles of Christian perfection as taught by Christ. Two other meditations keep the same aim in view, that of calling forth strong and effectual resolutions; one deals with the "three classes of men," the other with the three grades or "modes" of humility. The third week, devoted to the sufferings of our Lord, confirms the penitent in his renunciation of evil and in his wholesome resolves. The fourth is a rapturous meditation on the risen and glorified Son of God.¹

The meditations are interspersed with various counsels and rules of life which, like the directions for making a choice, are serviceable not merely for periods of contemplation but for the whole course of life: such for instance are the rules for the "discernment of spirits"; for the treatment of scruples; for the right expenditure of income; for moderation in food, drink, and sleep; for the practice of meditation, examination of conscience, and other forms of prayer; for the duty of mental obedience to the Church. These last especially are worth their weight in gold.² At their head stands the primary maxim: "We must be ready

¹ Cf. M. MESCHLER, S.J., *Die Aszese des hl. Ignatius: Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, LXXV. (1908), 269-280, 387-399.

² Cf. *Les Règles du pur Catholicisme selon St. Ignace de Loyola* per Le P. MAURICE MESCHLER, S.J.: *Collection de la Bibliothèque des Exercices de St. Ignace, Enguien*, 1907, n. 7.

to renounce from our heart our private judgment, to obey in all things the bride of Christ, and this bride is that Holy Mother the Church." We must, he says further, exhort to frequent confession, communion, and attendance at Mass, not forgetting also prayer in choir, religious vows, the veneration of relics, pilgrimages, indulgences, rules of fasting and abstinence, exercises of penance; and these not only in their inward but also in their external practice. We must also praise the building and adornment of churches and the veneration shown to sacred images and pictures. Above all ought we to praise the precepts of the Church, always defending her teaching and never opposing it. We should always be more ready to praise than to blame the statutes and conduct of those set over us as superiors, even if the persons themselves should not always be praiseworthy, "since to attack them in sermons or in intercourse with the common people would be more likely to give rise to murmurings and scandals than to edification." In speaking of the predestination of men, of faith, and of grace such expressions should be avoided as are likely to cool the zeal of the faithful for good works.¹ The holy fathers should be read diligently, yet without depreciation of the scholastic teachers.² With great emphasis Ignatius insists on the duty of the unconditional surrender of the understanding to the judgment of the Church led by the Holy Spirit.³ The Spiritual Exercises close in the contemplation of the divine love which finds expression in a striking prayer of absolute self-surrender to God.

¹ Rule, 14-17.

² Rule, 11. C. MIRBT (Ignatius von Loyola, *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXXX., 68) thinks notwithstanding that it cannot be proved that Ignatius "felt driven to test the substance of his belief by Scripture and Church doctrine."

³ Rule, 13.

One who has no knowledge of a spiritual world, to whom the power of prayer is a negligible quantity, and in whose scheme of life there is no room for the inroads of grace, can neither fully grasp the meaning of this book nor explain its effects. Besides this the Exercises were intended to be gone through and not merely read. Their object has been described as the attainment of that tranquillity of soul which consists in the annihilation of the personal will, the surrender of volition. On the other hand, a non-Catholic scholar has recently pointed out with truth that, as a matter of experience, those who have gone through the Exercises and are to this day going through them, have received moral forces which previously they had not possessed. The effect of the Exercises is not to weaken but to intensify and strengthen personality. They are the masterpiece of "a sapient educational system."¹

Ignatius himself called his book "Spiritual exercises whereby a man may be enabled to conquer himself and so order his life that he is never under the domination of any inordinate affection whatever."² Thus prayer is not to

¹ Die Geistlichen Übungen des Ignatius von Loyola: Eine psychologische Studie, von Prof. Dr. KARL HOLL, Tübingen, 1905, I., 2, 35. Holl is in conflict with widespread opinions which GÖTHEIN (p. 235 *seq.*) also shares. The strong opponent of the Jesuits, JOH. HUBER (Der Jesuitenorden, Berlin, 1873, 25), admits on the whole that Ignatius in the Exercises shows "a great knowledge of the human heart" and "proves himself to have deep insight as a teacher of Christian ascetics."

² "Ejercicios espirituales para vencer á sí mismo, y ordenar su vida, sin determinarse por afeccion alguna que desordenada sea." Title of *Anotaciones* at the beginning of the book (Ejercicios espirituales de S. Ignacio de Loyola, Barcelona, 1892, 26). The Exercises were written in Spanish, yet he himself often made use of a Latin translation. The book, especially in the Latin rendering, has often been printed since 1548, but mostly for members of the Order only. There is a list of editions in C. SOMMERVOGEL, Bibliothèque de la Compagnie

him an end in itself. He will not merely teach men prayer as such, he will rather offer them a selection of reflections, readings, oral prayers, examinations of conscience, exercises, penance, which in a determined sequence and combination shall lead up to the point when, as the book itself says, "a man may set himself free from all inordinate affections and, having done so, seek for and find the will of God in conformity with which to rule his life and secure the salvation of his soul."¹ Through abundant prayer and works of spiritual and corporal penance he seeks to receive the grace of heaven; with this grace the whole man, under the guidance of a wise director,² enters into co-operation. Memory, supported by the power of imagination, places before the soul³ the doctrines and facts of revelation, especially those contained in Holy Scripture; the internal and the external correspond; for the daily work of life are substituted loneliness and silence; yet all this is only a means to an end. The central activities are those of the understanding and the will; the truths of

de Jésus, nouv. éd., Bibliographie, V., Bruxelles-Paris, 1894, 59-74; IX., 1900, 608, 609. Cf. also HEIMBUCHER, III., 2nd ed., 28, n. 2. A new critical edition will appear in the Monumenta Ignatiana (cf. Ser. I., I., 7, 8). The original autograph copy of the Exercises has not been preserved; on the other hand, the Spanish copy, written in an unknown hand and containing some thirty alterations in Ignatius's own writing, still exists. A photographic reproduction by DANESI in Rome, 1908.

¹ Anotaciones, n. 1 (*loc. cit.*, 9, 10).

² *Ibid.*, n. 2, 6, 7, 17, and so forth. The necessity of such direction is strongly insisted on in the *Directorium*—an introduction or key to the Spiritual Exercises which was taken in hand by order of a General Congregation of the Society in 1558 and after much consultation was drawn up in its final form in 1599 by the General, Claudius Aquaviva (*Directorium Exercitiorum spiritualium*, c. 2, n. 6, 7: *Institutum Societatis Jesu*, III., Flor., 1893, 510).

³ Exercises. Second week, second meditation, first point.

faith are to be weighed calmly and then applied to the action or inaction of the individual life.

Reasonable reflection, independent calculation, magnanimous resolves going into all the details of life, that it is which Ignatius requires. What have I done for Christ? What am I doing for Him? What do I intend to do for Him?¹ Fear and shame, admiration and gratitude, trust and a generous and enthusiastic love must be called forth and the whole character possessed by such sentiments. The master of the Exercises must take care that this possession be not distorted into a morbid excitement, that zeal be not too precipitate. He must give warning against rash and inconsiderate vows,² must prevent injury to health from austerities of penance and, however holy the religious life may be, must not recommend it while the Exercises are in progress. Now is the time "when the Creator and the creature, the creature and the Creator, must deal together alone without the mediation of man."³

In the preface which was prefixed in 1548⁴ to the first impression of the Exercises, the author says that he had drawn his material not so much from books as from his own inner experiences and the knowledge acquired in directing the souls of others. The literary sources of the Spiritual Exercises have been industriously explored. It

¹ Anotaciones, n. 2 and 5. First week, first meditation, first point and colloquy. Directorium, c. 8, n. 1; c. 9, n. 4, 5, 9-11; c. 34, n. 1-3.

² GOTHEIN (p. 239) asserts incorrectly that Ignatius declares all vows taken during the Exercises to be invalid. Such a declaration, moreover, would have been powerless as being contrary to the laws of natural and Christian morality

³ Anotaciones, n. 14, 15, 18. First Week, tenth addition.

⁴ *Exercitia spiritualia* S. P. Ignatii de Loyola, Romae, 1870, xvi-xvii; *cf.* also Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 511. See also HETTINGER'S fine work, *Die Idee der geistl. Übungen nach dem Plane der hl. Ignatius*, 2nd ed., Regensburg, 1908; see also HEIMBUCHER, 28-32.

is probable that while at Montserrat, Ignatius had become acquainted with the *Ejercitatorio de la vida espiritual* which Garcia de Cisneros, nephew of Cardinal Ximenes and first Abbot of the reformed Benedictine convent of Montserrat, had composed for the use of his community and had had printed there in 1500.¹ From him he may have borrowed the title of his book and even some of its details.² Cisneros himself, to all appearance, was largely indebted to the writings of two Netherlanders, "Brothers of the Common Life," Gerhard Zerbolt of Zutphen and Jan Mombaers, who in their turn again had been influenced by St. Bonaventure and others. Ignatius has taken some things from the *Imitation* of Thomas à Kempis and some from Ludolph of Saxony's *Life of Christ*. The meditation on the Two Standards is found in part in a mediæval sermon attributed to St. Bernard,³ while the teaching on the three degrees of humility has a striking affinity with remarks of Savonarola on this subject.⁴

But these are only single stones. The building, taken as a whole, is a compact and uniform work of art constructed on new and original lines.⁵ In particular, none of the writers prior to Ignatius have given such sound and thorough instruction on that form of prayer which, in a restricted sense, we speak of as meditation. There is an entire absence of all emotionalism, he addresses himself to the reason and to faith and imparts his teaching in a manner fitted for the school of life.

¹ WATRIGANT, 28-31; ASTRAIN, 152-160.

² Cf. J. M. BESSE in Rev. d. Questions Historiques, LXI. (1897), 22-51.

³ MIGNE, Patr. lat., clxxxiii, 761. For another example from the Middle Ages, see MICHAEL, Gesch. des deutschen Volkes, IV., 229.

⁴ WATRIGANT, 102; cf. *ibid.*, 50-59, 77.

⁵ HOLL even recognizes this (pp. 4, 5).

One remarkable phenomenon always remains. Here was a soldier, who had learned no more than to read and write and had only just said farewell to a life adrift among the temptations of the world, who yet was able to compose a spiritual work remarkable for inwardness, lucidity, depth, and strength. By Ignatius himself and his first disciples this was regarded as a special instance of the overruling power of the Spirit of God.¹ Paul III. handed the book over for examination to three theologians, who had full permission to amend and to improve, and without altering a single word they gave their *approbatio*.²

At the request of Francis Borgia, Duke of Gandia, Paul III., on 31st July 1548, issued a brief declaring the Exercises to be full of piety and holiness; they had contributed much to the greatest successes achieved by Ignatius and his institution; he (the Pope) gave his unreserved approval, and urged upon the faithful that they should use the work to their own advantage.³

Ignatius wished that by means of the Exercises the spirit of his Order might be stamped upon the novices. "This is our armoury," he used to say; he did not wish to see any other method of prayer observed in the Society.⁴ The Exercises were, moreover, the means of bringing to him, in 1543, his first German adherent. Peter Canisius, then a young man of twenty-two years of age, wrote about them from Mayence to a friend: "They taught me to pray in spirit and in truth; I felt new forces, as it were, within

¹ Autobiography, n. 27 (pp. 52, 53); letter of J. Polanco of Dec. 8, 1546 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 526).

² Preface to edition of 1548, p. xvii (see *supra*, p. 15, n. 4). The testimonials of the three censors are often printed at the beginning of the Exercises (*cf. ibid.*, xvi).

³ *Ibid.*, xii-xv.

⁴ BARTOLI, I., I, n. 20 (*supra*, p. 3, note).

me; they poured themselves from my soul over my body; I was completely transformed into a new man."¹

The Society of Jesus in all ages has seen in the Exercises, and particularly in the meditation on the "Two Standards," the pattern of its existence.²

Their influence soon spread beyond the limits of the Order and was felt by the great spiritual teachers and saints of the age: Louis of Granada, John of Avila, Ludovicus Blosius of the Order of St. Benedict.³ Gerhard Kalckbrenner, Prior of the Carthusians of Cologne, wrote on the 31st of May 1543 to one of his brethren, "Such a treasure would be worth seeking for even if one had to go to the Indies."⁴ The scholastic theologian Joannes Cochläus rejoiced that "now, once more, a teacher had at last arisen who could speak to the heart."⁵ Dietrich van Heeze, private secretary and confessor to Adrian VI., affirmed in 1543 that "he had gained so much from the Exercises that he would not give them away were he offered the whole world in exchange."⁶ St. Francis of Sales also recommended the Exercises,⁷ and St. Charles Borromeo introduced them among the clergy of the province of Milan.⁸

¹ Canisii Epistulae, ed. BRAUNSBERGER, I., 77.

² ORLANDINUS, *Historiae Societatis Jesu*, P., I., 1, 10, n. 66 (*cf. supra*, p. 3, note); BARTOLI, I., 2, n. 36; PINIUS, *Comm. præv.*, n. 344-346; CHRISTOPH. GENELLI, S.J., *Das Leben des hl. Ignatius von Loyola*, Innsbruck, 1848, 123, 124; J. WIESER, S.J., in the *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.*, VIII., 85, 87.

³ Canisii Epistulae, I., 104; BARTOLI, I., 1, n. 18.

⁴ *Cartas y otros escritos*, del B. P. Pedro Fabro, I., Bilbao, 1894, 421, 422.

⁵ "Magistri circa affectus" (*ibid.*, 335, 336).

⁶ POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 55.

⁷ *Traité de l'amour de Dieu*, I., 12, ch. 8 (*Cœuvres*, V., Annecy, 1894, 334).

⁸ *Concilium provinciale*, IV., p. 23 (*Acta Ecclesiae Mediolanensis*, Mediolani, 1599, 143, 171).

All Orders have adopted the custom of going through the Exercises at stated periods. "The little volume of Exercises of Loyola," says a modern historian, "has exercised on his own Order and the Catholic priesthood generally an influence of a powerfully pronounced character."¹ He might have added that this transforming and sanctifying influence has also been felt, and will continue to be felt, by laymen in the most varied conditions of life.²

Ignatius remained about a year at Manresa. Then the craving for occupation drove him, the man of action, again into the world. He set out for Palestine, that region of the world which, in the Middle Ages, had been the magnet of so many crusaders. Wearing the garb of the poorest pilgrim, he sailed from Barcelona to Gaeta and from there made the journey to Rome; he set foot, for the first time, in the Eternal City on Palm Sunday, the 29th of March 1523, when he stayed for fourteen days and received the blessing of Pope Adrian VI. From Rome he proceeded, begging his way, to Venice, and there took ship to the Holy Land.

In Jerusalem heavenly consolations filled his soul; he would, there and then, have given himself up to missionary work among the Mohammedans, but the Franciscan Provincial, appealing to the Papal decrees, ordered him, under ecclesiastical censure, to return to his native country. The pilgrim bowed to the will of God and returned to Barcelona, as he had come, a beggar.³

What was he now to do? He thought of entering a religious house, but his decided preference was for a life

¹ M. RITTER, Ignatius von Loyola, *Histor. Zeitschr.*, XXXIV., 317.

² Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, IV., 16th ed., 405.

³ Autobiography, n. 29, 40, 45-47 (pp. 54, 60-65); RIBADENEIRA, *Vita*, l. I, c. 10. For fresh details about the journey, see CREIXELL (p. 35 *seqq.*), quoted *infra*, p. 20, n. 2.

dedicated, in freedom, to God's glory. But one thing before all else was clear to him—the need of a well-grounded education.¹ Thus at the age of thirty he took his place for two years on the benches of a boys' school at Barcelona and learned Latin amongst the children. Two pious women, Isabel Roser and Ines Pascual, supplied him with food.² For higher studies he went to the universities of Alcalà and Salamanca. In all the three towns he gave the spiritual exercises and devoted himself to other works of fraternal charity. The followers who attached themselves to him wore all alike coarse brownish clothing and were thus nicknamed by the people the "Ensayalados."³

Many pious souls, especially women, came to Ignatius for spiritual instruction and comfort. His studies suffered in consequence, and he became inevitably the subject of remark. Ignatius incurred the suspicion of being an emissary of the fanatical "Alumbrados," who, under the pretext of being the recipients of signal gifts from God, were spreading distinctive errors throughout Spain, and he was put in prison. In Alcalà his detention lasted forty-two days, in Salamanca twenty-two; he refused to employ legal aid, and in both towns he was adjudged innocent by the ecclesiastical authorities. Ignatius afterwards was able to assure King John III. of Portugal that he had never had intercourse with the Alumbrados or known any of them.⁴

¹ Autobiography, n. 54 (p. 68); POLANCUS, Vita, c. 5 (p. 31).

² For Ignatius's residence and charitable work in Barcelona before and after the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, see J. CREIXELL, S. Ignacio in Barcelona, 38 *seq.*, 91 *seq.* According to CREIXELL (p. 46, n. 3) the name ought to be written "Roses"; she herself signed "Roser" (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 338, 341 *seq.*).

³ Autobiography, n. 56-61 (pp. 69-73); POLANCUS, *loc. cit.*; records of the trial at Alcalà (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 608).

⁴ Autobiography, n. 57-62, 69, 70 (pp. 70-74, 78, 79); POLANCUS, c. 5 (p. 34 *seq.*); Ignatius to John III., dat. Rome, March 15, 1545 (Mon.

He was now, however, drawn towards that institution, which still maintained the reputation, centuries old, of being the centre of European learning—the Sorbonne in Paris. Ignatius reached the French capital on the 2nd of February 1528. Seven years were now spent in methodical study; after three and a half years of philosophical training he took his master's degree;¹ then succeeded the course of theology. In order to collect alms for his support he appeared repeatedly during the vacations in Bruges and Antwerp, and once visited London.²

In Paris also Ignatius came under the suspicion of heresy; but the inquisitors, Matthæus Ori and Thomas Laurentius, both of the Dominican Order, established his innocence. Laurentius drew up for him and his associates a highly honourable testimonial; he was so much pleased with the Book of Exercises that he asked to be furnished with a copy.³

The followers Ignatius had gathered round him in Spain had left him again; in their place he found at the Sorbonne a company of friends from whom he was never to be separated. The first was Pierre le Fèvre, commonly called Peter Faber, a Savoyard of the simplest piety and keenest intelligence, who was among those who shared board and lodging with him at the College of St. Barbe.⁴

Ignat., Ser. I., I., 297); records of trial at Alcalà (Ser. IV., I., 598–603). Cf. F. FITA in *Boletin de la r. Acad. de la Hist*, XXXIII. (1898), 429, 457 *seq.*

¹ POLANCUS, c. 6 (p. 41); RIBADENEIRA, l. 2, c. 1.

² Autobiography, n. 73, 76 (pp. 80–82); POLANCUS, c. 6 (p. 41); ASTRAIN, 59.

³ Autobiography, n. 81, 86 (pp. 85, 88). The evidence in *Acta Sanctorum, Julii*, VII., n. 185.

⁴ Autobiography, n. 82 (p. 85); *Memoriale B. P. Fabri, nunc primum in lucem editum a P. MARCELLO BOUIX, S.J., Lutet. Paris, 1873* (large edition), 7, 8.

In the same company was a young nobleman of Navarre, endowed with brilliant gifts and filled with far-reaching plans: his name was Francis Xavier. Ignatius won the affection of the young professor and withdrew him from associates who at heart had become estranged from the teaching of the Church. Francis finally went through the Exercises and placed himself unreservedly in the hands of his friend.¹ Through the Exercises the Spaniards Diego Laynez and Alfonso Salmeron came to the same determination; they were followed by Simon Rodriguez, a Portuguese; by Nicolas Bobadilla, a Spaniard; by the Savoyard, Claude Le Jay; and the Frenchmen, Pascal Broët and Jean Codure. They almost all had taken the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.²

On the Feast of the Assumption, the 15th of August 1534, an important step was taken which has often been described as the laying of the foundation stone of the Society of Jesus. Ignatius and six of his first associates—Le Jay, Broët, and Codure had not yet joined the band—passed beyond the city to Montmartre, on the declivity of which lay the sequestered chapel of St. Denis belonging to the Benedictine nuns.³ Peter Faber, the only priest among them, celebrated Mass, and during the Holy Sacrifice each one vowed on the Blessed Sacrament to observe the rules of poverty and strict chastity and to make the pilgrimage to Jerusalem, there to work for the salvation of souls; yet they determined, as long as their studies lasted, to retain possession of their means. For the sake of their pilgrim's

¹ Autobiography, n. 82 (p. 85); POLANCUS, c. 7 (p. 48); Monumenta Xaveriana, I., Matriti, 1899-1900, 204.

² POLANCUS, Vita, c. 7 (p. 49 *seq.*).

³ See H. JOLY, St. Ignace de Loyola, Paris, 1899, 116, n.; CH. CLAIR, S.J., La Vie de St. Ignace de Loyola, Paris, 1891, 162-175. Cf. Vol. X. of this work, p. 476 *seq.*

journey they resolved to go to Venice and await during the course of a year an opportunity of securing a passage; if none offered, they vowed to throw themselves at the Pope's feet and place their services at his disposal.¹ The next two years saw the same solemnity repeated and, at least in the year 1536, three new members were among the participants.²

In the meantime Ignatius had been obliged, on account of impaired health, to revisit his home; from there he went to Venice. Among those whom he introduced to the Spiritual Exercises were Pietro Contarini and Gasparo de Doctis, the auditor of the Papal nuncio Girolamo Verallo. Even here Ignatius was not beyond reach of calumny, and things went so far that judicial proceedings were opened against him; the sentence, however, was in his favour, and de Doctis lavished praise on his teaching and his character.³

Ignatius was the first of the ten comrades to enter Venice. Francis Xavier and the remaining eight wandered on foot from Paris in the winter of 1536, leathern knapsacks on their backs containing the Bible, the Breviary, and their college note-books, the rosary round their necks, towards the city of the lagoons.⁴ There they stayed two months

¹ Autobiography, n. 85 (pp. 87, 88); *Memoriale P. Fabri*, 12; *P. Simonis Rodericii Commentarium de origine et progressu Societatis Jesu* (account of the origin and progress of the Society of Jesus, compiled at Lisbon in 1577 by Simon Rodriguez at the command of the General, Everard Mercurian) in the *Epistulae PP. Paschasio Broëti, Claudii Jaii, Joannis Codurii et Simonis Rodericii*, Matriti, 1903, 457-459.

² *Memoriale P. Fabri*, 13; *RODERICIUS, Commentarium*, 459.

³ Autobiography, n. 92, 93 (p. 92). The text in *Acta Sanctorum, Julii*, VII., n. 255-258. P. Contarini was not the Cardinal's nephew (*cf. TACCHI VENTURI*, I., 444, n.).

⁴ *RODERICIUS*, 462-474; letter of Laynez, 113-114; *Memoriale Fabri*, 13.

and a half; they worked in the hospitals, ministering to the souls and bodies of the sick; then they started for Rome to obtain the blessing of the Pope on their coming pilgrimage.¹

Only Ignatius was left behind. He feared two men in Rome: Cardinal Carafa, with whom he had had shortly before serious differences of opinion in Venice, and Pedro Ortiz, the Imperial plenipotentiary at the court of Rome, to whom, as a teacher in the University of Paris, he formerly had been obnoxious.² But it was no other than Ortiz who gave his friends a warm recommendation to the Pope. Paul III. ordered the Parisian theologians to carry on a debate with several Roman doctors while he was eating his dinner. When he had finished his meal he called the former to him and, with outstretched arms, said he was delighted to see so great learning combined with so great modesty. He gave them willingly his permission to go to Jerusalem, sent unsolicited on two occasions money for the journey, but remarked that he did not believe that they would ever reach that city.³ Cardinal Carafa also showed great signs of favour.⁴

The pilgrims now returned to Venice. There, in virtue of special permission from the Pope, Ignatius, Francis Xavier, and five others were ordained priests.⁵

A ship had now to be waited for. The ten dispersed themselves over various towns of the Republic during the time of suspense, and Verallo gave them authority to preach

¹ Letter of Laynez, 115, 116.

² POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 56); Ignatius to Carafa, Venice, 1536 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 114-118); Autobiography, n. 93 (p. 93). The opposition between Carafa and Ignatius has not yet been fully cleared up (see Stimmen aus Maria Laach, XLIX., 533).

³ RODERICIUS, 486, 487.

⁴ Autobiography, n. 96 (p. 94).

⁵ RODERICIUS, 487, 488; letter of Laynez, 117.

and hear confessions.¹ But the experience of previous years was now repeated; owing to the war between Venice and the Turks the whole year went by without a single ship setting sail for Palestine;² they were thus free from their vow of pilgrimage and had to see in Rome the Jerusalem of their quest. First of all they resolved, however, to visit the Italian universities, "in order to see," as Laynez expressed it, "whether God was calling the one or the other student to their manner of life."³ But here a doubt arose. In Paris the companions of Ignatius had come to be called "Inīgista."⁴ They now asked themselves: "When questioned as to what congregation we belong to, what answer can we give?" They agreed to say that they belonged to the Society of Jesus.⁵ The love of Jesus had united them; Jesus was their leader, and His glory the only thing they strove for.⁶ True servants of Christ two of them were also recognized to be by Vittoria Colonna in Ferrara, the city which had fallen to their lot. This great woman supported them—they were Le Jay and Rodriguez,—consulted them in cases of conscience, and called them to the attention of Duke

¹ Documents in Acta Sanctorum, *loc. cit.*, n. 252-254.

² Letter of Laynez, 116.

³ *Ibid.*, 118; cf. RODERICIUS, 491; POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 62).

⁴ Epistolae P. H. Nadal, I., 2.

⁵ The name "Jesuit" is older than the foundation of the Society. In the course of the 15th century it was used sometimes of a pious Christian, sometimes of a Mendicant brother. It seems to have been given to members of the Society first in the Netherlands in 1544, and certainly as a term of odium. The name was for a long time displeasing to the Society, but they gradually got reconciled to it and finally made use of it themselves (N. PAULUS in the Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol., XXVII., 174, 175; cf. also *ibid.*, 378-380, and BRAUNSBERGER, B. P. Canisii Epistulae, I., 121, 134, 135).

⁶ POLANCUS, Vita, c. 9 (pp. 72-74); Bartoli, I., 2, n. 36.

Ercole II., who heard them preach and had recourse to Le Jay as confessor.¹

Ignatius himself, with Faber and Laynez, went on foot to Rome, to prepare the way for the others. At their last halting-place, La Storta, where Ignatius was at prayer in the little church, he had a deep spiritual experience. He believed that he had a vision of Christ, and heard Him say, "I will be gracious to you." Ignatius told his companions, and observed, "I know not what awaits us at Rome; perhaps crucifixion; but one thing I know certainly, Christ will be gracious to us."² This vision also heartened him strongly to inscribe the name of Jesus on his banner and on that of his companions.³

Their reception by the Curia was on the whole a chilling one. Ignatius said that he felt that the windows were shut;⁴ yet the Pope accepted willingly the services of the new association. Faber and Laynez were to lecture on theology at the Sapienza, while Ignatius endeavoured to propagate his Spiritual Exercises. The Imperial ambassador, Pedro Ortiz, went with him for forty days to Monte Cassino; when he had gone through the Exercises he appeared to himself to be a different man: he had, in his own words, in those forty days learned a philosophy of which he had never dreamed in the long years of his activity as a teacher in Paris.⁵ Cardinal Contarini also

¹ RODERICIUS, 496; letter of Laynez, 118; POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 63); BARTOLI, I., 2, c. 38; TACCHI VENTURI, V. Colonna, 152 *seqq.*

² POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 63 *seq.*); RIBADENEIRA, De actis S. Ignatii, n. 83. Cf. TACCHI VENTURI, I., 413 *seqq.*

³ POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 64); RIBADENEIRA, *loc. cit.*; J. P. MAFFEIUS, S.J., De Vita et moribus Ignatii Loiolae (*supra*, p. 3, note), l. 2, c. 5 (in the edition Ignatii Loiolae vita, postremo recognita, Antverpiae, 1605, 72); ORLANDINUS, l. 2, n. 29-31, 62. Cf. also TACCHI VENTURI, I., 587.

⁴ Autobiography, n. 97 (p. 95).

⁵ *Ibid.*, n. 98 (p. 95); POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 64); BARTOLI, I., 1, n. 18.

underwent the same under the guidance of Ignatius, and was so enchanted that he copied the Book of Exercises with his own hand; he thanked God that He had at last sent the man on earth for whom he had been longing. Ortiz and Contarini became great friends and patrons of the new Society.¹

Ignatius and his followers first found shelter in a villa on the slope of the Pincian Hill near Trinità dei Monti; Quirino Garzoni, a Roman nobleman, had handed it over to them for the sake of Christ. They begged alms for their support, but the house was too remote; they therefore moved at Easter 1538 into the inner city to a spot which was no better situated, and afterwards in the same year hired from Antonino Frangipani a roomy building in the neighbourhood of the Capitol near Torre del Melangelo which is standing to this day.²

In May 1538 the ten members of the Society were all assembled in Rome. They found, wrote Ignatius to Spain,³ a soil bearing few good fruits and many evil. The Cardinal-Legate, Vincenzo Carafa, gave them full powers to preach and dispense the Sacraments.⁴ They began to preach and give instruction in Christian doctrine in different churches and in public places. The Romans opened wide their eyes when they saw men mount the pulpit who did not wear monastic dress; this was so unprecedented that many said, "We thought that no one

¹ Cartas del B. P. Fabro, 6; POLANCUS, *loc. cit.*; MAFFEIUS, l. 2, c. 6, 12; ORLANDINUS, l. 2, n. 34; BARTOLI, l. i, n. 18.

² Now the Palazzo Delfini in the Via Delfini, No. 16; RODERICIUS, 499; POLANCUS, c. 8; TACCHI VENTURI, *Le case abitate in Roma da S. Ignazio di Loiola*, Roma, 1899, 9, 13-18.

³ To Isabel Roser, dat. Rome, 1538, Dec. 19 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 138).

⁴ Memoriale Fabri, 14, 15. Text of the document in *Acta Sanctorum, Julii*, VII., n. 295-298.

but monks had a right to preach.”¹ Another innovation also was preaching after Easter; it was not customary in Rome to have sermons except during Advent and Lent.² Ignatius preached in Spanish in S. Maria di Monserrato.³ Many now began to go to confession and to communicate frequently. This practice, Rodriguez relates, had almost become obsolete in many places in Italy; if a man went every eight days to the Lord’s table, he became the town’s talk; he was spoken of in letters to friends at a distance as a strange novelty.⁴

The “reformed priests,” as Ignatius and those with him were called, continued to gain the confidence of the people. They were soon able to say, “If our number were quadrupled we should not be able to satisfy all wishes.”⁵ Those were auspicious beginnings; but the storm was soon to break which threatened to snap the tender plant.

Paul III. in March 1538 went to Nice to restore peace between Charles V. and Francis I.;⁶ the Augustinian, Agostino Piemontese, now thought that the moment had come to disseminate in Rome the Lutheran doctrine which

¹ RODERICIUS, 499.

² Ignatius to Isabel Roser, dat. Rome, 1538, Dec. 19 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 139).

³ POLANCUS, c. 8 (p. 64).

⁴ RODERICIUS, 477. Ignatius, on the contrary, in the Exercises notes the practice of weekly communion as a sign of genuine Catholic feeling (*Regulae ad sentiendum vere cum ecclesia*, n. 2). He goes further and recommends daily communion as circumstances require (see his letter to the Sister, Teresa Rejadella, of Nov. 15, 1543, in Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 275 *seq.*). Cf. also TACCHI VENTURI, I., 230 *seqq.*

⁵ Roman memorial of the first companions, 1539, first published in the *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu latinae et hispaniae cum earum declarationibus*, Matrity, 1892, 298.

⁶ See Vol. XI. of this work, pp. 279 *seqq.*

he cherished at heart. He preached it from the pulpit, yet with caution, but Loyola and his helpmates saw through the man, and after ineffectual exhortations addressed to him in private, they began to refute him publicly. This infuriated the friar, and also certain Spaniards among the circle of his admirers. They scattered the gravest suspicions abroad against the new preachers. As their reports obtained wide credence, Ignatius demanded an investigation; it was an easy matter for him to convict the principal organ of these calumnies, a Navarrese, of falsehood, and obtain his expulsion from Rome. The others now made a declaration that they held the Fathers to be free from blame; but with that they wished proceedings to come to an end and the matter to be buried in oblivion; they won over the Cardinal-Legate¹ and the Governor of the city to acquiesce in this escape from the difficulty.

But Ignatius and his comrades would have been debarred from any successful work unless every taint of suspicion were removed from the integrity of their conduct and doctrine. Ignatius, therefore, was immovable in his determination that the case should go on; he went to Paul III. at Frascati and in a long interview obtained the Pope's permission that the trial should go on to the end and the decision be given in accordance with strict judicial formality. This, however, was not obtained without difficulty; the opposing party had powerful connections and were not inexperienced in the art of intrigue. But circumstances intervened favourable to Ignatius, for at that very moment there were in Rome three of the judges before whom he had previously appeared: the episcopal

¹ Not to the Imperial ambassador, as translated by H. BÖHMER (*Die Bekenntnisse des Ignatius von Loyola, Stifters der Gesellschaft Jesu*, Leipzig, 1902, 64).

Vicar of Alcalà, the Parisian Inquisitor Ori, and the auditor of the nuncio at Venice; these were unanimous in insisting on his innocence and that of his friends. From Vicenza, Bologna, Siena, where they had worked, came glowing testimonials, as also from Cardinal Contarini and the Duke of Ferrara. At last, after the troublesome suit had dragged on for eight months, Benedetto Conversini, as senior judge in temporal and ecclesiastical cases at Rome, gave his decision: he pronounced complete acquittal on all the ten; all the charges brought against them were groundless.¹

Ignatius was now able to say his first Mass in peace of mind. It took place on Christmas Day 1538 at S. Maria Maggiore.² This coincided with a fresh opportunity of showing acts of charity to the Roman poor. The winters of 1538 and 1539 were marked by the severity of the cold and the scarcity of food,³ and people lay on the open street stark and half dead. Towards evening the fathers went their rounds, gathered the unfortunates in groups, and took them to the roomy chambers of the Frangipani dwelling-house; there they distributed bread which they had begged, spread out beds of straw, and gave instructions in the faith and prayed; sometimes from 200 to 400 persons were thus tended. Their example kindled others; Cardinals and other great personages collected money; in

¹ Ignatius to Pietro Contarini and to Isabel Roser, dat. Rome, 1538, Dec. 2 and 19 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 134-136, 138-143): *Autobiography*, n. 98 (p. 96); letter of Laynez, 148; POLANCUS, c. 9 (pp. 67-69); RODERICIUS, 502-507; *Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti*, 385, n. 1. The original judgment is given in Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 627-629.

² Ignatius to his brother in Loyola, dat. Rome, Feb. 2, 1539 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 147).

³ Cf. BONTEMPI, 376; MANENTE, 263, and the **memoranda of Cornelius de Fine (Cod. Ottob., 1614, Vatican Library).

the hospitals of the city upwards of 3000 poor and sick were ministered to.¹

"After we had been declared innocent," Peter Faber relates in his *Memoriale*,² "we placed ourselves unreservedly at the disposal of Paul III." The Pope accepted the offer gladly, and showed willingness to send some of the community into different spheres of work. The latter, however, had come already to important determinations. Ignatius himself at a later date³ directed the secretary of the Order, Polanco, to give explanations on this point to the rector of the college at Bologna, who was at work on an account of the origin of the Society. Polanco wrote: "The first of those whom our father Ignatius drew round him in Paris, as well as he himself, betook themselves to Italy, not with the intention of founding an Order but with the purpose of going to Jerusalem to preach among the infidel and there to die. But they were unable to get to Jerusalem and had to remain in Italy; and as the Pope afterwards availed himself of them for the service of God and of the Holy See, then the idea of forming themselves into a corporate society came under consideration."⁴ Polanco wrote more explicitly in his Life of the founder: "When they had come together again in Rome in 1538 they were still without any intention of forming any perpetual association or order."⁵ But in 1539, so Laynez relates

¹ Letter of Laynez, 146; Polancus, c. 8 (pp. 65, 66); RODERICIUS, 499, 500.

² *Memoriale*, 15.

³ On July 29, 1553.

⁴ This important letter was first published in *Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., V., 259, 260.

⁵ POLANCUS, c. 9 (pp. 69, 70); *cf.* letter of Laynez, 114; J. CREIXELL, S.J., *Explicación crítica de una cuestión hagiográfica*; *Razón y Fe*, XX., Madrid, 1908, 215-222; on the contrary side, FR. VAN

later on, "we gave ourselves to prayer and afterwards came together and weighed the circumstances of our vocation point by point. Each one set forth as it seemed to him the pro and contra of the matter. In the first place, we were of one accord that we should found a society having a permanent existence and not one limited to the term of our natural lives."¹

At first there were great differences of opinion on the question of obedience. Towards Ignatius all indeed had shown persistently the utmost reverence and submission; but the office of Superior, to whom voluntary subjection was offered, had changed in the different groups from week to week and afterwards, when they were altogether at Rome, from month to month.² Were they now, in addition to the vows of poverty and chastity which they had taken already in Venice at the hands of Verallo, to pledge themselves to yet another, that of obedience to one of their own body and so constitute themselves an order? From contemporary memoranda it is evident that nearly three months of prayer and penitential exercises preceded their decision. Finally, they all agreed to take the vow.³

To Ignatius was assigned the task of drawing up the draft constitution of the Order. Cardinal Contarini, who

ORTROY, S.J., *Manrèse et les origines de la Compagnie de Jésus*; *Analecta Boll.*, XXVII. (1908), 393-418.

¹ Letter of Laynez, 146, 147.

² RODERICIUS, 489, 490.

³ The notes were first published by P. J. J. DE LA TORRE, S.J. (*Constitutiones Soc. Jesu lat. et hisp.*, 297-301); *cf.* also RODERICIUS, 508, 509. The resolution of April 15, 1539, to take the vow of obedience, with the autograph signatures of Ignatius and his companions, is in the Museum of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith at Lyons; facsimile in P. M. BAUMGARTEN, *Die kath. Kirche*, III., Munich, 1902, 33, and in *Les Missions Cath.*, XIV. (1882), 571; *cf. ibid.*, 576.

looked upon the members of this company¹ as his "special spiritual sons in Christ," undertook to recommend their rules for confirmation to the Pope. But the latter referred the document to the Master of the Sacred Palace, Tommaso Badia, a Dominican, who after two months' examination pronounced the scheme to be "pious and holy."² On September the 3rd, 1539, Contarini was able to write the news to Ignatius from Tivoli, where Paul III. was sojourning, that he had received the draft with Badia's opinion. "To-day I read aloud to the Pope all the five heads. He was much pleased with them, and confirmed them with expressions of strong approval."³ From other witnesses we learn that the Pope, after receiving Contarini's report, exclaimed: "There is the finger of God!" He then lifted up his hand in blessing and said, "We give this our benediction; we approve it and call it good."⁴ Cardinal Ghinucci, Paul III. enjoined, was to draw up a brief appropriate to the occasion, or, at his own discretion, a Bull.⁵

But before such a document appeared there was much ground to be covered. Paul III., in the first instance, ordered three Cardinals to examine the draft. One of them, the influential Bartolommeo Guidiccioni, was opposed, on principle, to new orders; it would be much better, he said, if the existing orders were cut down to the number of four; he would not even look at the scheme of Ignatius.

¹ Ignatius to Cardinal Contarini, dat. Rome, 1540, March-April (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 156).

² Evidence of Cardinal Contarini in DITTRICH, *Regesten*, 305, and BARTOLI, I., 2, n. 45.

³ *Cartas de San Ignacio*, I., Madrid, 1874, 433, 434 (*cf.* above, p. 1 *seq.*, n. 1). The minutes, which were approved by the Pope orally on Sept. 3, 1539, are in TACCHI VENTURI, I., 412.

⁴ RODERICIUS, 508, 509; ORLANDINUS, l. 2, n. 83.

⁵ *Cartas*, *loc. cit.*; DITTRICH, *loc. cit.*

But Loyola did not give in; he obtained many prayers, and vowed that he would have three thousand Masses said. Meanwhile good news came from without; Cardinal Ennio Filonardi was full of praise of Faber and Laynez, whom he had besought the Pope to send to his Legation, and Cardinal Francesco Bandini, Archbishop of Siena, gave very favourable accounts of Broët.¹ Suddenly Cardinal Guidiccioni asked to see the plan of the Society; he was delighted with it; here, he declared, an exception ought to be made, and used his influence strongly for its confirmation.² The preparation of the Bull was carried out forthwith.³

This important document was issued by Paul III. at Rome on the 27th of September 1540.⁴ It begins with the mention of the first ten members. These men, "impelled, as we may well believe, by the Holy Spirit,"⁵ had left the world, formed themselves into a community, and for many years worked in the Lord's vineyard. Then follow the ground lines of the constitution of the Order, commonly called the "formula of the institution." The word *societas* is used in the military sense of a troop or squadron, which is "emblazoned with the name of Jesus,

¹ Letter of Laynez, 147; Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 203; BARTOLI, l. 2, n. 46.

² Letter of Laynez, 122, 123, 147, 148; RODERICIUS, 514, 515; POLANCUS, c. 9 (p. 72); MAFFEIUS, l. 2, c. 12; ORLANDINUS, l. 2, n. 113, 114.

³ For Cardinal Ghinucci's fears, see L. Tolomei's letter of Sept. 28, 1539, in DITTRICH, *loc. cit.*, 379. Cf. also TACCHI VENTURI, I., 579 *seq.*

⁴ Litterae Apostolicae, quibus Institutio, Confirmatio et varia Privilegia continentur Societatis Jesu, Antverpiae, 1635, 7-16; Bull VI., 303-306.

⁵ "Spiritu sancto, ut pie creditur, afflati." In the second Bull of confirmation of Julius III., of July 21, 1550, the expression is simply: "Spiritu Sancto afflati" (Litt. Apost., 8, 58).

and consists of men who fight for God under the banner of the Cross and serve none other than Christ the Lord and His representative on earth, the Pope of Rome." The special aim of the Order is defined to be the furtherance of Christian thought and practice and the propagation of the faith by means of preaching, spiritual exercises, Christian doctrine, confession, and other works of charity. To the three ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience another was joined whereby the Society was pledged in a special way to the Pope's service; in virtue of this, it was said, "We must, where the salvation of souls and the spread of the faith are concerned, we must do all within our power to execute on the spot every command of the present Pope and his successors without any hesitation or evasion, whether we be sent to the Turks or to any other infidel peoples, even in the regions named the 'Indies,' or among heretics or schismatics or even, if needs be, among the faithful." As especially necessary and profitable the explanation of the fundamental grounds of the Christian faith was then insisted on. The Superior, to be chosen by the members, shall appoint to and distribute the offices. Capital or settled incomes shall not be held by individuals or by the Society, except in the case of the colleges serving as seminaries for the younger members, whose spiritual discipline and educational training are entirely in the hands of the Society. The daily office is to be said by the members individually and not in common.

The Pope confirmed these constitutions, took the members under his own special protection and that of the Apostolic See, and gave permission for the formation of more detailed regulations. The number, however, of members of the Order was not to exceed sixty. Ignatius was highly gratified at thus provisionally securing so much, and expressed himself in terms of warm gratitude to Cardinal

Contarini;¹ nor was Cardinal Guidiccioni passed over without marks of recognition from the whole Society.²

In the April of 1541 Ignatius was chosen General of the Order³ by the unanimous voice of the other nine, present and absent, only one of the latter abstaining from sending his vote. "I chose him," wrote Jean Codure, "because I have always recognized in him a fervent zeal for God's glory and the salvation of souls. He also has always been amongst us as the least of all and the servant of all."⁴

On the 22nd of April 1541 the six members resident in Rome made a pilgrimage to the seven principal churches and in a chapel of the Basilica of S. Paolo fuori le mura took these solemn vows while Ignatius celebrated Mass.⁵

The newly professed conducted themselves so well that the Pope, not quite three years later (March 14th, 1544), cancelled entirely the restriction of the Society to sixty members; at the same time he enjoined that the rules drawn up for itself by the Society should at once receive confirmation.⁶ In a brief of June 1545 he further gave the Society, "in view of the great advantages it had conferred and continued to confer on the House of God," full

¹ Ignatius to P. Contarini, Rome, 1540, Dec. 18 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 168).

² Francis Xavier wrote on March 18, 1541: "We have said 250 Masses for Cardinal Guidiccioni" (Mon. Xaver., I., 245, 295). Simon Rodriguez also writes from Lisbon on Oct. 8, 1540, of 55 Masses which he had recently said for the same Cardinal (*Selectae Indiarum Epistolae nunc primum editae*, Florentiae, 1887, 4); cf. also BARTOLI, l. 2, n. 46.

³ The account of the election by Ignatius himself is in the *Constitutiones Soc. Jesu lat. et hisp.*, 313, 314.

⁴ Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 419.

⁵ POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, n. 26.

⁶ This and following Papal letters are in the *Litterae Apostolicae*, 17-32.

powers to preach everywhere, to give absolution for all sins, even in cases reserved for the Holy See, the exceptions of the Bull "Coena Domini" alone being retained, to administer the Eucharist and other Sacraments without obtaining previous permission from the bishop or parish priest, yet without prejudice to any third person.

In the meantime it had become evident that there were very many excellent priests who had been of great help as coadjutors to the Order but yet were inadequately furnished with the educational and theological requirements demanded in the professed members of the Society. In 1546 Paul III. therefore ordered their admission; after a period of probation they were to be allowed to take the vows, but in their simple, not their solemn, form. Likewise, according to the usage existing in other orders, lay brothers were to be received for domestic service.

In the following year the Pope bestowed a plenary indulgence, obtainable once in a lifetime, on anyone offering up prayers in honour of our Lord's Passion after making confession to a Jesuit priest.¹ Paul III. conferred besides extensive indulgences² transferable to others on the founder, and encouraged the formation of new settlements by special graces.³

¹ OLIVERIUS MANAREUS, S.J. (†1614), *De rebus Societatis Jesu Commentarius*, Florentiae, 1886, 120, 121. In the *Mandati, 1542-1546, f. 65, is included: "Sacerdotibus Societatis Jesu Christi de Urbe rubrum unum cum dimidio salis nigri gratis et amore Dei, dat. 1543, Sept. 12" (State Archives, Rome).

² BRAUNSBERGER, IV., 30; *cf.* also *Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., I., 172, 526 *seqq.*; perhaps the letter here printed, of June 11, 1547, led RANKE (*Päpste*, I., 10th ed., 123) to make the strange statement that "Loyola, and later on his adherents, had, like the Spanish 'Alumbrados,' made a general confession a condition of absolution."

³ *Synopsis Actorum S. Sedis in causa Societatis Jesu*, I., Florentiae, 1887, 4-8; BRAUNSBERGER, I., 362, n. 1, 696.

The Pope crowned these enactments by the Bull issued, at the instance of Francis Borgia, four weeks before his death. For years Ignatius had wished the Society to possess such a "Mare Magnum" as that granted by Sixtus IV. to the Franciscans—a Bull, namely, which should amalgamate once for all the various decrees, privileges, and graces for which otherwise special application for reconfirmation would always be necessary in each particular case.¹

The Bull appeared on the 18th of October 1549. It conferred exemption on the Society from taxation and from all episcopal jurisdiction; without the General's consent no member of the Order can accept a bishopric or any other ecclesiastical dignity; the Order cannot be called upon to undertake the spiritual direction of women; the faithful are permitted to confess to and receive communion from the priests of the Order without asking permission of their parish priest—save at Easter and on the administration of the Viaticum. Then follow many other grants and plenary faculties in favour of the Order; the earlier guarantees are confirmed and in respect of missionary countries largely extended.²

After the year 1539 and the first authorization of the Society of Jesus its external circumstances began to improve. The fathers who had hired the Frangipani dwelling were joined by Pietro Codacio, who relinquished his rich benefices. This first Italian Jesuit was a man of noble family, much beloved by ecclesiastics of the higher ranks;³

¹ Ignatius to Oviedo, dat. Rome, 1547, Nov. 24 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 653, 654; POLANCUS, Chronicon, n. 273). Cf. S. Franciscus Borgia, III., Matriti, 1909, 28.

² Litterae Apostolicae, 35-56; Bull. Rom., VI., 394-401.

³ POLANCUS, *loc. cit.*, n. 11; MAFFEIUS, l. 2, c. 14; TACCHI VENTURI, *Lè case*, 6, 28, n. 2.

he undertook to provide a dwelling, sustenance, and clothing for his colleagues.

The first great requisite was a church. Ignatius had his eye on the parish church of S. Maria degli Astalli—popularly known as S. Maria della Strada—not far from the foot of the Capitol and near S. Marco, the Papal summer residence. The building was narrow and inconvenient but in a very good situation for mission work.¹ Codacio went to the Pope and asked him to bestow the church on the Order; they received it in 1540; in 1541 the Bull was drawn up, and in 1542 Ignatius took possession of the church and its appurtenances. Codacio took over the administration of the parish.² Besides this he acquired in 1543 the neighbouring and almost abandoned parish church of S. Andrea de la Fracta, with permission to let the church and parish lapse. Six years later the Pope added two other parish churches to the above and in exchange erected four chapels in S. Marco and transferred thither the parochial cures of these four churches.³ In order to be better able to supervise his church, Ignatius settled in 1541 in a hired lodging of small compass near at hand. Codacio begged from Cardinals and bishops, enlarged the church, and built alongside of it the General's house; this was occupied in 1544.⁴ The picture of Our Lady over the high altar, then scarcely noticed, became afterwards an object of great veneration.⁵ On the site of S. Maria della Strada was afterwards erected, by the

¹ Polanco to Araoz, dat. Rome, 1547, Oct. 31 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 616, 617); ORLANDINUS, I., 3, n. 15.

² TACCHI VENTURI, *Le case*, 28, 29, 39; POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, n. 49; TACCHI VENTURI, I., 415 *seq.*

³ *Synopsis Actorum S. Sedis*, I., 9, 10.

⁴ POLANCUS, *loc. cit.*; TACCHI VENTURI, *Le case*, 19, 20, 32.

⁵ Cf. TACCHI VENTURI, 27, 38-40, where the current representations of the picture and the Church are for the first time corrected.

munificence of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, the magnificent church of the Gesù.

The devotion and gratitude of the new Order towards the Pope was displayed in the work undertaken by them in Papal Rome. Here there were unbelievers and sinners in plenty to convert. Among the numerous Jews there were many who recoiled from the acceptance of the Christian faith through an anxious fear for their temporal belongings. Ignatius succeeded in obtaining from the Pope, whose behaviour towards the Jews was marked by traditional leniency,¹ a brief dated the 21st of March 1542 which stated that no Jew was to lose his property because of his conversion to Christianity. Even children who became Christians against their parents' will were to receive their full portion of inheritance. What had accrued through usury or other unjust means must be restored to the rightful owners, where the latter were to be found; otherwise it belonged to the convert. The same concessions were granted to all unbelievers who received baptism.²

¹ Besides RIEGER-VOGELSTEIN, II., 61 *seq.*, *cf.* also *Revue juive*, IX., 81; *Archiv für Kirchenrecht*, LIII., 36 *seq.*; *Univ. Cath.*, XIX., (1895), 102 *seq.* In order to protect the Jews in Rome from outrages, the celebration of the Passion play in the Colosseum was instituted in 1540 (see ADINOLFI, II., 388; DEJOB, *Influence*, 210 *seq.*; GREGOROVIVUS, *Schriften*, III., 189; VATASSO, *Per la storia di dramma sacro*, Roma, 1903, 86). The decree of Paul III. of May 12, 1540, which forbade the persecution of the Jews under the severest penalties and anathemas, has been published from the original text by SEEBERG in *Hengstenbergs Evangel. Kirchenzeitung*, 1900, No. 50. As a remedy for the usury which was practised in Rome, certainly not by the Jews only, Giovanni da Calvi, the Franciscan, succeeded in opening a Monte di Pietà in Rome which was approved and privileged by Paul III. in a Bull of Sept. 9, 1539. Cardinal Quiñones was appointed Protector of the Compagnia del Monte (see TAMILIA, *Il. s. Monte di Pietà di Roma*, Roma, 1900, 24 *seq.*).

² Bull. VI., 336, 337. RIEGER-VOGELSTEIN (II., 63) is as wrong in his dating of the Bull as in his comments upon it.

In order to facilitate conversions two houses, on Loyola's advice, were established for catechumens, the one for men and the other for women; a confraternity was also founded composed of distinguished and influential personages in Roman society, and Cardinal Marcello Crescenzi was named Protector.¹ Paul III. issued a Bull in February 1543 praising the work and conferring spiritual graces.² On Whitsunday 1544, amid a great concourse of people, five Israelites were solemnly baptized, one of them being a Rabbi with a great reputation for learning. In 1544 Jews, Moors, and Turks to the number altogether of forty were baptized, and at the beginning of the following year ten others received the same sacrament.³

Another undertaking had still better results. This aimed at the removal of a permanent evil which the Renaissance had bequeathed to Rome. Prostitution was a sore from which the capital of the world suffered now as in times past.⁴ It was not enough to provoke to tears by penitential sermons; if there were to be no relapses some asylums of refuge would have to be provided. The convent of the Maddalena was indeed in existence for those who wished to take the veil; but it was not sufficient for all those who sought admission, and among the latter were also married women who had left their husbands. Ignatius determined to create a home for such as these; many showed a willingness to help, but no one wished to be the first to begin;

¹ Ignatius to Francis Xavier, dat. Rome, July 1543, and to the Society, 1543 or 1544 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 249, 268, 269).

² Bull. VI., 353-358.

³ Ignatius to the Society, dat. Rome, 1543 or 1544 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 249, 250); Jeronimo Doménech, S.J., to Simon Rodriguez, dat. Rome, 1545, Jan. 29 (Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 773-774).

⁴ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 348, n. 5, and Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XXXI., 413.

he therefore set his hand to the work. Codacio had unearthed a number of antiquities on his building site and sold them for about a hundred ducats. The General gave them for the erection of an institution which was to be called the Casa di Santa Marta. Here married women could stay until they were reconciled with their husbands or remain permanently if they wished to persevere in a moral life; as also could sinful women in the single state until they entered wedlock or professed religion.¹ Cardinals supported the undertaking, and the Pope sent help in money and recommended the work in a special Bull.²

Leonora Osorio, the wife of the Spanish ambassador Juan de Vega, who confessed weekly to Ignatius, took an energetic part in the work. Also Margaret of Austria, the wife of Duke Ottavio Farnese of Camerino, gave effectual help.³ The young Jesuit, Peter Faber of Halle, wrote on the 29th of April 1546 from Rome to Cologne, "Every day one of us goes to pray for S. Marta's house."⁴ In order to secure the permanency of the institution high ecclesiastics, nobles, and other distinguished persons formed themselves into the "Compagnia della Grazia" under the patronage of Cardinal Carpi, at whose request the Society

¹ Ignatius to F. Xavier, dat. Rome, 1543, July 24, and Jan. 30, 1544, (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 269-271); POLANCUS, Chronicon, 1, n. 68; RIBADENEIRA, De actis S. Ignatii, n. 46. Cf. especially TACCHI VENTURI, I., 420 *seqq.*

² Doménech to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, 1545, Jan. 29 (Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 774); Ignatius to F. Xavier, dat. Rome 1543, July 24, and 1544, Jan. 30, and to Simon Rodriguez, dat. Rome, 1545, Nov. 21 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 269, 329, 330); RIBADENEIRA, Vita, l. 3, c. 9.

³ Report written by order of Ignatius in Rome, 1545 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 305, 306).

⁴ Rheinische Akten zur Gesch. des Jesuitenordens, 1542-1582. Bearbeitet von JOSEPH HANSEN, Bonn, 1896, 51.

undertook for a while the religious direction of the institution.¹ On the other hand, Ignatius gave to three noble ladies of Rome the three keys of S. Marta.² He was told that his work was hopeless; that these unfortunates were already too hardened in vice. He replied: "If I only succeed in rescuing one of them from one night of sin, I shall not regret my trouble."³ His success far exceeded his hopes; in 1545 he was able to write to Spain: "There are now from thirty-seven to thirty-eight women in S. Marta; most of them are doing spontaneously penance for their past life."⁴ Up to the end of 1547 more than a hundred women of this class had been brought to a better way of life.⁵

Another institution almost contemporaneous, which also owed its existence to Ignatius or in which he was at least one of the original co-operators, was that of S. Caterina dei Funari. Maidens whose innocence was imperilled by poverty or bad upbringing were here educated until they married or entered a convent.⁶

The Roman orphanages found a warm friend in the General of the Jesuits. Margaret of Austria sent him on one occasion 300 ducats for distribution among the poor.

¹ Ignatius to Francis Xavier and the Spanish Jesuits, dat. Rome, 1543, July 24, and beginning of 1544; Bartolomé Ferron, S.J., to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, 1546, April 12 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 269, 270, 286, 287, 371, 372); RIBADENEIRA, l. 3, c. 9; ORLANDINUS, l. 4, n. 75; BARTOLI, l. 4, n. 18.

² Ignatius to Leonora Osorio, dat. Rome, 1546, July or Aug. (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 564).

³ RIBADENEIRA, l. 3, c. 9.

⁴ Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 305.

⁵ Polanco to Araoz, dat. Rome, Oct. 31, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 613).

⁶ RIBADENEIRA, l. 3, c. 9; ORLANDINUS, l. 4, n. 8; *cf.* LANCIANI, II., 64 *seq.*

He was told that the Princess wished in this way to assist him and his associates in their poverty, but he never appropriated a penny of it; all was sent to the convents and benevolent institutions of Rome and an exact account rendered.¹

Ignatius in the first year of his generalship entered the Archconfraternity of S. Spirito in Sassia with the promise of a yearly alms to the hospital.² One of the tests which he imposed upon his novices consisted in ordering them to work in the Roman hospitals.³ The priests of the Society observed with sorrow that many of those whom they visited on sick-beds departed life without the Church's means of grace; Ignatius thereupon remembered the ordinance of Innocent III., ratified by the twelfth General Council, the tenor of which was that the aid of the physician of the soul should be invoked before that of the physician of the body. He earnestly recommended the observance of these enactments with this alleviation, that on the first and second day of illness a doctor should be allowed to attend the patient, but not again on the third and fourth day, unless the latter had in the interval made his confession. All the theologians and canonists of the Penitentiaria signified their approval in writing. The Pope was much pleased with the proposal; about Epiphany in the year 1544 it began to be put into execution.⁴

Two years before this the indefatigable General of the

¹ RIBADENEIRA, Dichos y hechos de N. P. Ignacio (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 413); *cf.* also letter of Laynez, 120.

² The deed of admission in Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 554-558.

³ *Cf.* HANSEN, *loc. cit.*, 145.

⁴ Ignatius to Cardinal Cervini, dat. Rome, June 24, 1543, and to Francis Xavier, dat. Rome, Jan. 30, 1544 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 261-267, 271); POLANCUS, Chronicon, n. 48.

Jesuits had supported a regulation which was destined to have an important bearing for Rome and the whole of Italy. While the Inquisition was especially active, sometimes too active, in the exercise of its functions in Portugal, here and there in Italy it seemed as if the watchmen on the roofs of Sion were fast asleep. "For this reason," wrote Ignatius to Portugal on the 28th of July 1542 to the Cardinals Juan Alvarez de Toledo and Giovanni Pietro Carafa, "I often made urgent representations; they spoke repeatedly to the Pope; now his Holiness has appointed six Cardinals" who were to form a Board of Inquisition. The Papal Bull appeared on the 21st of July 1542.¹

The reconciliation of enemies was a work of charity which commended itself to the Jesuits' circle of activity.² Ignatius himself travelled in the year 1548 to Tivoli and to Città Sant' Angelo in order to pave the way for the restoration of amity between these two places, then at feud. He was successful in getting them to accept as arbitrator Cardinal de la Cueva, and also called in the help of Margaret of Parma and the Bishop, Archinto, and finally ensured the conclusion of a treaty of peace.³

The most difficult and most important pacification due to Ignatius was that between Pope Paul III. and King John III. of Portugal. John was afraid that his country might be ruined through the machinations of the Jews, who, in his father Manuel's reign, had been often compulsorily baptized but in secret remained loyal to Judaism. He thought that he ought to protect himself against these

¹ Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 218, 219; *cf.* also POLANCUS, *loc. cit.*, n. 66. The Bull in Bull., VI., 344-346. *Cf. infra*, pp. 504 *seqq.*

² Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 618. *Cf.* also Anton Vinck's letter to the Jesuits of Louvain and Cologne, dat. Rome, about May 1548, in HANSEN, 128.

³ POLANCUS, n. 228; ORLANDINUS, l. 8, n. 5.

“New Christians” by an exceptionally severe jurisdiction in matters of belief on the lines of the Spanish Inquisition. The disputes into which he had thus been led already with Clement VII.¹ were renewed in an accentuated form under Paul III.² At first the Pope had suspended the last decrees of his predecessor,³ but on closer examination he confirmed on October 12, 1535, those relating to the New Christians, which were as just as they were lenient.⁴ King John III., filled with deep hatred for these Jews in disguise, now tried to compass his object by means of diplomatic negotiations in Rome. As Charles V. intervened on his side, Paul III. gave way, for on the 23rd of May 1536 he ratified the institution of a permanent Inquisition in Portugal.⁵ The King disregarded the stipulations which the Pope had inserted to protect the

¹ Cf. Vol. X. of this work, 371 *seq.*

² Cf. besides the numerous documents in Corp. dipl. Port., III., IV., V., and VI.; SCHÄFER, III., 337; SCHMIDT, Zeitschr. für Gesch., IX., 167 *seq.*; ERSCH-GRÜBER, XVIII., 471 *seq.*; Atti dell' Emilia, N.S., IV., I, III *seq.*; Kathol. Schweizerbl., I. (1885), 341 *seq.*; Archiv für kath. Kirchenrecht, LIII., 27 *seq.*, and the characteristic works of Herculano and Kunstmann given there; see also Histor. Zeitschr., IX., 121; further, PINCHEIRO CHAGAS, Hist. de Portugal, V., Lisbon, *s.a.* Numerous documents still unpublished concerning the conflict are in the Secret Archives of the Vatican (*Min. brev., Carte Farnes., 2, and Nunz. di Portug., I., A) and in Cod. H 33 Inf. of the Ambrosian Library in Milan. The instructions for Girol. Capodiferro sent to Portugal in 1537 (dat. Feb. 17, 1537), in the Altieri Library, Rome (VII., E IV., f. 263), those for J. Lippomanno sent in 1542, in the Royal Library, Berlin (Inf. polit., XII., 67 *seq.*), and in the Doria Pamphili Archives, Rome (Istrug., I., 329 *seq.*). A series of documents relating to the subject in Cod. 264, N.B., 3, Vol. I., of the Library of Ferrara.

³ Corp. dipl. Port., III., 171 *seqq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 254 *seq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., 302 *seqq.*

New Christians, and serious complaints were raised in Rome, for John III. did all he could to turn the Inquisition into a Royal tribunal. In vain Paul III. raised protests against the King's arbitrary behaviour; all the Pope's endeavours on behalf of justice and moderation towards the Jews, and the preservation of the ecclesiastical character of the Inquisition, were without avail. Negotiations were bandied to and fro without result and fresh difficulties arose over and above those already existing.

Miguel de Silva, Bishop of Viseu, a noble of the highest rank, had left Portugal and gone to Venice contrary to the King's wishes. Nevertheless, Paul III. made him a Cardinal and summoned him to Rome. John III. now confiscated his episcopal revenues and moreover forbade the Bishop to hold intercourse, even by writing, with his diocese. He was also unwilling to admit a Papal nuncio into the country. Ignatius took the matter very seriously, and wrote a confidential letter to his old friend and colleague Simon Rodriguez, who was resident at the court of Lisbon. It was reported in the Curia, he said, that Rodriguez gave absolution to persons who had helped the King in his aggression on the Cardinal of Viseu and thus laid themselves under the bann of the Church; he, the General of the Order, was, however, unable to believe this; Rodriguez indeed had no faculty empowering him to do so; he would, besides, thereby do injury to the things of God, the Church and the Holy See.¹ At the beginning of 1542 the situation was so embittered that Portugal was on the point of breaking off communication with the Holy See.²

¹ Ignatius to Simon Rodriguez, dat. Rome, March 15, 1542. The letter was first published in *Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 196-199.*

² See the Florentine envoy's *despatch of Feb. 3, 1542 (Florentine State Archives).

Ignatius, who, like many others,¹ laid the blame not on the King but on his counsellors, sought then in every way to arrive at a peaceable solution.² The dispute was prolonged for some years to come; Ignatius, however, never halted in his exertions as peacemaker. On the 14th of December 1545 he wrote to Rodriguez that for the sake of the Inquisition and the bishopric of Viseu he had gone to see the Pope at Montefiascone; he had there spoken very fully to the Pope and had made a favourable impression. This communication was followed directly by another announcing that an agreement had been reached. The Pope would withdraw the brief directed against the action of the Inquisition; the New Christians would be allowed a respite to admit of their expatriation; after their departure the Portuguese Inquisition should be put on the same footing as the Spanish. The confiscated revenues of the bishopric of Viseu were to be dealt with in accordance with the advices from Lisbon; all were to be placed in the hands of Cardinal Farnese.³ The desired Bull on the Inquisition appeared on the 16th of July 1547, and the New Christians were given a year's grace. The King was earnestly recommended to employ gentle measures; Cardinal Farnese was made administrator of Viseu, received the revenues of the bishopric, and pledged himself under his own hand to remit them to Cardinal Silva; only a sum was to be deducted for the stipend of the bishop-coadjutor placed in charge of the diocese;⁴

¹ Thus the Portuguese nuncio (see his *report of July 13, 1535, in the *Nunz. di Portug.*, I., A, f. 6, Secret Archives of the Vatican), and later also Paul III. (see RAYNALDUS, 1545, n. 58).

² Cf. his letter to Rodriguez of March 18 and July 28, 1542 (*Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., I., 195 *seq.*, 216 *seq.*).

³ *Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., I., 346-350.

⁴ *Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., I., 193, 194, 348, 349; *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, I., 224, n. 8, 496-509; RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 131, 132; ORLANDINUS,

the nomination of the latter was to be left to the King.¹

About this time a certain Fra Valentino Barbaran sent I., 5, n. 27; Corp. dipl. Port., VI., 166 *seq.*; HERCULANO, Hist. de Inquisição em Portugal, III., 6th ed. (1897), 282 *seq.*; MACSWINEY, Le Portugal et le Saint Siège, III., Paris, 1904, 210-212.

¹ Ignatius has quite recently been blamed for having, in the face of ancient Church discipline and the proposals for reform just then in progress, procured for Cardinal Farnese, already richly endowed with Church benefices, additional possession of a Portuguese bishopric. But Farnese was merely bishop in name and, for the sake of peace, Rome wished to find for the King an honourable way of retreat. A few years later Viseu received a new bishop. As regards the New Christians, the latter had agents at Rome who were trying to prevent the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition into Portugal. One of them, Diego Hernandez, wished to bring Ignatius round to his side. They had a two hours' conference in the Pantheon. Hernandez, according to a letter from Ignatius to Rodriguez of Aug. 17, 1542, in Spanish, "made solemn professions, always bringing forward something new digressing from the subject. I therefore determined to cut the matter short and gave him my oath before the Blessed Sacrament that in this matter my desire was the same as his, to be of the greatest service to all erring souls. I was, however, of opinion that no obstacle should be put in the way of the Inquisitors, on the assumption that their functions were authorized and that they carried out their duties properly, and that this should specially be observed in cases where the Inquisitors received no material recompense for their labours and reaped injury rather than advantage from them. He tried, however, always to adduce fresh reasons and to spin out the conversation. At last I broke it off: I said to him, he need not waste any more time on the subject with me and I had no wish to waste mine with him. My conscience forbade me to think otherwise than I did. Since then ten or twelve days have passed and I have not seen him again" (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 225, 226; Cartas de S. Ignacio, I., 142, 143). For the wrong translation, a mutilation of this letter by A. N. DRUFFEL (Ignatius von Loyola an der Römischen Kurie, Munich, 1879, 12) and those who have followed him, see Anal. Boll., XIII., 72; DUHR, S.J., Jesuitenfabeln, 4th ed., Freiburg i. Br., 1904, 33-39. For a criticism of Druffel, see also Zeitsch. fur. kathol. Theol., IV., 380 *seq.*

to Paul III. a memoir containing far-reaching complaints against the Jesuits. They were desirous, he said, of reforming the whole world ; they had no permission from the Pope to carry out their work at S. Marta, and wished to drive all married women who had been untrue to the marriage vows from Rome, with many other accusations. Cardinal Crescenzi, by command of the Pope, perused the document and drew up a report. He considered it to be of no importance.¹

In obedience to the Pope the Jesuits tranquilly pursued their good work among the Roman people. They frequently occupied the pulpit,² and Vittoria Colonna, who had withdrawn into retirement with the Benedictine nuns of S. Anna de' Funari, asked to have one of them as her preacher.³

The General set a good example to his subordinates in giving instruction in Christian doctrine ; no sooner had he entered on his office than he began in S. Maria della Strada to expound the elementary principles of the Christian faith ; many grown-up persons were among the audience. Although he had little time for preparation and spoke an Italian strongly marked by Spanish idioms, yet his addresses made a great impression. He usually closed with the words : " Let us love God with all our heart, with all our soul, and all our will ! " He uttered this with great emphasis and animated visage ; many, as Laynez and

¹ Ignatius to Miguel Torres, dat. Rome, Oct. 13 and 18, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 447, 448 ; Cartas de S. Ignacio, I., 304, 305). Druffel has not understood the Spanish letter which forms the source of this report ; what Barbaran wrote has been put by Druffel (*loc. cit.*, 28) in the mouth of Cardinal Crescenzi, " the incorruptible."

² Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 774 ; Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 332, 373.

³ Report to the Spanish Jesuits, dat. Rome, 1545, about May (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 306, 307).

Ribadeneira who both saw and heard him testify, sought the confessional forthwith in deep contrition.¹

Among the Roman clergy were many, as Polanco wrote to Spain in 1547, "badly in need of instruction." On this account Nadal gave three times a week in S. Eustachio a lecture on the professional duties of the priesthood; the Vicar of the Pope enjoined attendance on all who had the cure of souls.² The success attending this regulation gave rise, apparently, to another determination. From all parts candidates for Holy Orders came to Rome who were unfitted for their office; it was therefore decided in 1547 that in future none should be ordained who had not previously made a general confession to a Jesuit and had undergone an examination in morals and learning by that Order. Ignatius had no other course open to him than to undertake this arduous task at least temporarily. "Up to the present," he wrote to Louvain in December 1548, "we have given a certificate of fitness to hardly a quarter of those who have presented themselves."³

The new Order was reserved with regard to the religious direction of women. When Ignatius and his companions came to Rome, he said to them, "We must be very careful to avoid intercourse with women, for there are many of high station"⁴ whose influence and example might be of great advantage to many souls. Such a one, in his opinion,

¹ RIBADENEIRA, *De actis*, etc., n. 47; *cf.* also Maffei, l. 2, c. 14.

² Polanco to Araoz, dat. Rome, Oct. 31, 1547 (*Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., I., 617); Report to Araoz and the Jesuits of Louvain and Cologne, dat. Rome, Oct. 31, 1547, and 1548, end of December (*ibid.*, Ser. I., I., 617; II., 286).

³ Bishop Archinto to Ignatius, dat. Bologna, Dec. 17, 1547; Opinion of Ignatius, dat. Rome, 1548, end of January; letter to the Jesuits of Louvain and Cologne, dat. Rome, 1548, end of December (*Mon. Ignat.* Ser. I., I., 658, 703, 704; II., 286).

⁴ "Illustri," *Autobiography*, n. 97 (p. 95).

was that virile character Margaret of Austria, whose marriage with the young Farnese was so unfortunate. Ignatius was confessor to her and her household, and when in 1545 she gave birth to twins, he was called upon to baptize one of them.¹ To please Cardinal Farnese, Ignatius also undertook that his Order should draw up rules and act as confessors² for the enclosed nuns near St. Peter's, known as the "Murate"; but this was an exceptional case. Requests often came to him from pious women living in the world, from individual religious, and from entire convents of nuns to be received into the obedience of his Society, but Ignatius in all such cases refused.³ "We who live here in the Curia," he said, "see every day how things are with the Franciscans and Dominicans and their convents of nuns, how much embarrassment is caused to the friars; we should fare no better."⁴

Nevertheless, it seemed at one time as if a female offshoot of the Society would spring up in Rome. The widow Isabel Roser, who had once been Loyola's pupil in spiritual things and in temporal matters his great benefactress, came in 1545 from Barcelona to Rome. She and some other women asked Ignatius to affiliate them to his Society. On his refusal they made such clamorous entreaties to Paul III. to order the General to receive them, that the Pope granted their request. Thus Isabel Roser, Lucrezia Bradine, and Francisca Cruyllas took the

¹ Report to the Spanish members of the Order, dat. Rome, beginning 1544; Ribadeneira and Faber to Araoz, dat. Rome, 1545, Aug. 29 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 290, 316, 317).

² Polanco to Araoz, dat. Rome, Oct. 31, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 613).

³ Cf. POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, 2, 475 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 421).

⁴ To Miguel Torres, dat. Rome, Sept. 10, 1546 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 421).

solemn vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience at the hands of Ignatius as Superior of their Order.¹

Isabel Roser betook herself with great devotion to the work at S. Marta,² but she had no idea of obedience. The direction of the new sisters cost much time and trouble, and they and those under their protection required bodily support. Roser in addition was surrounded by a swarm of relations; it was said in Rome that the Jesuits wished to get possession of all their means and were keeping them in Rome by force. Through Ardinghello, Ignatius had representations made to the Pope, who was in residence at Orvieto, that such occupations were not befitting for men

¹ For the "supplicatio ad Pontificem, ut emittere Societatis vota permetterentur," *cf.* the remarks by POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, n. 87, p. 149, n. 1. A document of Dec. 25, 1545, concerning a gift of Isabel Roser, wherein Ignatius appears as "Prepósito de la venerable Compañía de Jesus, Perlado y Superior de la dicha Señora Isabella, y en cujus manibus ella hizo profession" is given in the *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, I., 471, 472. "La hermana y madre Isabel Roser," "Sor Lucrecia," "La Madre Sor Lucrecia," "La Hermana Cruyllas," say the Jesuits Antonio Araoz and Andrés de Oviedo in letters which (dat. Valencia, Dec. 22, 1545, and Gandia, Jan. 26, 1547) they sent to Bartolomé Ferron, S.J., and to S. Ignatius at Rome. Araoz addresses I. Roser in a letter from Valencia to Rome, Dec. 22, 1545, as "Charisima Hermana." An old notice of I. Roser's letter to Ignatius, dat. Barcelona, Dec. 10, 1547, says: "Haec fuit professa Societatis, propter quam deinde cautum fuit, ne curam susciperemus monacharum" (*Epistolae mixtae ex variis Europae, locis ab anno 1537 and 1556 scriptae*, I., Matriti, 1898, 245-247, 335, 450; *cf.* also *ibid.*, 29). That Cruyllas vowed "de commissione suae Sanctitatis obedientiam . . . Ignatio, et forsán pro tempore existenti Praeposito Societatis . . ., atque castitatem et paupertatem . . . in ejusdem manibus solenniter," appears from a document drawn up at Rome, Nov. 3, 1546, at the command of Paul III., by his vicar, Bishop Filippo Archinto (*Acta Sanctorum, Julii VII.*, n. 416-420).

² Ferron to Rodriguez, dat. April 12, 1546 (*Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., I., 372).

who ought to be working all over the world in the great interests of the Church.¹ The Pope agreed, and gave directions that the Order should be released from the obligation of receiving women into their obedience or of undertaking permanently the direction of their souls.² Accordingly, in the autumn of 1546 a Papal dispensation released Roser and her companion Cruyllas from their vows of poverty and obedience; they were, however, permitted to enjoy the graces and indulgences of the Society exactly as if they were still members.³ Ignatius wrote to Roser telling her that he therefore had no longer any claim on her as a spiritual daughter under his obedience, but that he would always regard her as a good and affectionate mother, as indeed she had been for so many years.⁴ Isabel felt herself deeply hurt; she even made a claim for damages which, however, the courts did not uphold.⁵ Full of complaints and anger, she returned to Barcelona; but in a few months' time she was writing from there for forgiveness, and later she made a distribution of her property and became a Franciscan nun.⁶

Ignatius had impressed a special stamp on his foundation and he took care that it should not be effaced. The suggestion that he should amalgamate his Order with that of the Somaschi he flatly refused.⁷ Miani's community

¹ Ferron to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, Nov. 21, 1545; Ignatius to Torres, dat. Rome, Oct. 9, 1546, and March 3, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 329, 330, 437-441, 488-493). Cf. also RIBADENEIRA, Vita, l. 3, c. 14; MAFFEIUS, l. 2, c. 7; ASTRAIN, I., 186 *seq.*

² POLANCUS, Chronicon, n. 172; cf. *supra*, p. 38 (Mare Magnum).

³ Acta Sanctorum, *loc. cit.*, n. 419.

⁴ Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 424, 425.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Ser. IV., I., 645-659.

⁶ Epistolae Mixtae, I., 449, 450; II., 54. CREIXELL, 113.

⁷ To P. F. de Medde, dat. Rome, March 15, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 474 *seq.*).

had less affinity with the Jesuits than the disciples of Gaetano di Tiene; the name of "Theatines" given to the latter was for many years extended also to the former. Ignatius tried very seriously to come to an arrangement with Cardinal Carafa for the recall of the Theatines to Rome¹ but he was steadily averse to any project for a fusion of the two Orders, and Cardinal Carafa was, on the whole, of the same opinion himself.² Later, in 1551, the Barnabites made similar overtures to Ignatius, but he rejected them, although they had the strong support of Archbishop Sauli of Genoa.³ On the other hand, Ignatius welcomed with delight the invitation of the strict Carthusian Order—without detriment to the individuality of the one or the other constitution—to mutual approximation and special communion in prayer and other good works.⁴

With equal determination the founder set himself to hold his spiritual children aloof from the strivings of ecclesiastical ambition. King Ferdinand I. in 1546 longed to see Le Jay made Bishop of Trieste. Ignatius entreated the King to renounce this scheme, but Ferdinand, on the contrary, desired Paul III. to command Le Jay to accept the dignity in virtue of his obedience to the Holy See; the King's ambassador at Rome was instructed to bring all pressure to bear. Thereupon Ignatius, as he reported to correspondents in Spain, made "incredible efforts" to frustrate the nomination. He succeeded in keeping the matter in suspense until the King declared that he would no longer

¹ Ignatius to Giovanni Bernardino Scotti, dated Rome, Aug. 18 and Sept. 8, 1548 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., II., 194-198, 229).

² RIBADENEIRA, Dichos, etc., Gobierno, n. 91 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 439, 440); BROMATO, II., 101 *seq.*

³ RIBADENEIRA, *loc. cit.*

⁴ Cartas de S. Ignacio, I., 403, 447, 448.

insist on his wishes ; Ignatius ordered Masses of thanksgiving to be said and the Te Deum to be sung.¹

To whatever extent his disciples might aim at Christian perfection and union with God through love, their master never estimated their progress by their demeanour nor even by the greater or less promptitude of their disposition, nor by their sensible enjoyment of prayer, but by the measure in which they exerted themselves to curb their unruly inclinations.² "Overcome thyself" was his favourite maxim. Far from depreciating bodily asceticism, he set a value on "fasts, the use of the discipline and other instruments of penance as useful and under certain circumstances necessary," but he esteemed far higher the subjection of an ambitious and selfish spirit.³ Obedience he asked for before everything else, not a forced and slavish, but a willing and high-hearted obedience. From time to time he would set a test. This happened at the beginning of 1548, when the college at Messina was established. Everyone in the house was to make a written declaration whether he was ready to go there, and when there to take up any office that the General might think good to appoint him to. Canisius assured him that he was equally willing to remain in Rome or to go to Sicily, India, or wherever else it might be ; if it must be to Sicily, he was then ready to go as cook, gardener, porter, scholar, or teacher in any

¹ Ignatius to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, Dec. 1546 ; Ferron to Torres, dat. Rome, March 2, 1547 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 450-453, 460-467) ; Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Venice, Sept. 25, 1546, and Cardinal Pio of Carpi to Ferdinand I., dat. Rome, Dec. 4, 1546 (Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 314-332, 392, 393).

² RIBADENEIRA, De actis, etc., n. 64, and Vita, l. 5, c. 10. Cf. the Exercises : second week : "De emendatione et reformatione vitæ."

³ RIBADENEIRA, De ratione S. Ignatii in gubernando, c. 2, n. 4, 5 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 447) ; Ignatius to the College of Coimbra, dat. Rome, May 7, 1547 (*ibid.*, Ser. I., I., 507).

department. All the five-and-thirty members who were with him gave wholly similar answers.¹

In order to train his children in humility Ignatius often allowed their acts of negligence and other faults to be inveighed against from the reading-desk of their dining-hall by a lay brother, Antonio Rion, a man of very humble origin who was an adept in the art of cooking and also had the gift of administering rebukes which could be as witty as they were sharp.² At the same time Ignatius always made allowance for individual temperament. One, said Ribadeneira, he would treat with the tender love of a mother, another with the authoritative love of a father. In distributing the more important offices and tasks,³ "in virtue of holy obedience," he often kept in view the inclinations of those under his control.⁴ In converse with others Ignatius was earnest and thoughtful, yet for all his economy of words always friendly, so that his spiritual sons could say that they never went away from him other than contented and happy.⁵

¹ BRAUNSBERGER, I., 262, 263.

² O. MANAREUS, Comment., 128; MAFFEIUS, I. 3, c. 6.

³ RIBADENEIRA, De ratione, etc., c. 4, and Dichos, etc., Gobierno, n. 12 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 419, 454).

⁴ Dictamina S. P. Ignatii generalia, collecta a P. Lancicio (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 478).

⁵ Responsio P. Manarei, n. 11 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 513); Dictamina (*ibid.*, 491). See also CAROL. LINEK, S.J., Imago absolutissimae virtutis . . . verbis et exemplis S. P. Ignatii de Loyola . . . expressa, Pragae, 1717, 214-221.

CHAPTER II.

CONSTITUTIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.—ITS WORK IN EUROPE AND THE INDIES.

THE principles on which Ignatius governed his Society could not remain in perpetuity as an unwritten tradition. There was need of a rule consolidated in writing. The professed members resident in Rome therefore met repeatedly and drew up a series of resolutions for the life of the new organization.¹

Their work was handed over for complete revision in 1541 to Ignatius and Codure; but as the latter died soon after, the task fell solely into the hands of Ignatius;² he began to commit his work to writing in 1547.³ About the same time he prepared, at the wish of his first companions and in close co-operation with his secretary Polanco, an amplified copy of that first draft of the rule of the Society which was contained in the Bull of confirmation of 1540. In this, not to mention other alterations, the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience are designated as solemn vows, while this at first had only been predicated of the vow of chastity. At the same time it was clearly declared that the supreme government normally was vested in the General. Together with "vows of the professed" the

¹ First published in the *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu lat. et hisp.*, 300-313, 316-329.

² *ASTRAIN*, I., 125.

³ *Ephemerides P. Nadal* (*Epistolae P. H. Nadal*, II., 2).

simple vows of the coadjutors and the scholastics were also mentioned. The first Papal confirmation of this second and final "Formula of the Institute" of the Society was contained in the Bull issued by Julius III. on the 21st of July 1550.¹

The first draft of the Constitutions was finished by Ignatius at the beginning of 1550.² He then summoned all the professed living out of Rome, who could conveniently attend, and other prominent members of the Society to the capital, and there laid his work before them for examination. From the notes which each one individually made³ he introduced alterations with Polanco's assistance. Even then he looked upon the work as still lacking completion. From 1552 onwards Nadal was ordered to promulgate and explain the Constitutions in Spain, Portugal, Germany, and Italy; Antonio Quadrio did the same in India. Experience was to be the test of all. As regards their substance the rules were now, generally speaking, completed; verbal changes Ignatius continued to make here and there up to his death in 1556. In 1558 at the first General Chapter of the Order they were, after improvement in some unimportant particulars, confirmed and held the force of law.⁴ As, in their leading principles,

¹ *Litterae Apostolicae*, 57-71; *ASTRAIN*, I., 126-134.

² First published in *Constitutiones lat. et hisp.*, 365-418.

³ Some are given in the *Const. Soc. Jesu lat. et hisp.*, 337, 338.

⁴ At that time also Polanco's Latin translation was compared with the Spanish original (there is a photographic reproduction by DANESI, Rome, 1908) and approved by the assembly (Ignatius to Achilles, dat. Rome, 1548, May 30; to Torres, dat. 1548, Sept. 1; to Oviedo, dat. 1548, Dec. 8; to Viola, dat. 1549, Oct. 28; *Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., II., 126, 214, 268, 584, 585; *Ephemerides P. H. Nadal: Epistolae P. H. Nadal*, II., 2, 4, 7-10; I. I. DE LA TORRE, S.J., in the *Constitutiones lat. et hisp.*, vi, viii-ix). Many later Popes from Gregory XIII. down to Leo XIII. have approved and confirmed these *Constitutiones*,

the Constitutions were fully shaped at the time of the death of Paul III., this seems the proper place to form an appreciation of them.

Ignatius had, it would appear, read the rules of the earlier Orders;¹ but when he came to write his own the only works upon his table were the Gospels and the *Imitatio Christi*. Following the rules concerning choice which he had laid down in the Book of the Exercises, he pondered the pro and contra of each particular question not merely once but repeatedly; later on he submitted the subject to renewed examination. He often wrote down the result on a sheet of paper and laid the latter on the altar on which he was wont to say Mass; hereupon he prayed to God for illumination², just as if he had not yet taken any action at all. Gonsalvez relates that Ignatius had told him that at such times God had granted him many illuminations. "He told me," Gonsalvez continues, "that he could assert this all the more easily as he was in the habit of writing down daily the experiences of his soul. He read aloud to me a considerable portion of these."³ If not all, yet a certain number of these revelations have been preserved, and they form a remarkable memorial of Christian mysticism.⁴

The actual Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, which which are valid to this day (*Constitutiones lat. et hisp.*, 1). For the constitution of the Society, cf. HEIMBUCHER, III., 2nd ed., 21-28.

¹ BARTOLI, l. 3, n. 3.

² ORLANDINUS, l. 10, n. 54, 55. Cf. also *Constitutiones lat. et hisp.*, 348, 349.

³ Autobiography, n. 100, 101 (pp. 97, 98).

⁴ A fragment had already been given by ORLANDINI (l. 10, n. 59-62). They were first published in Spanish from the original transcript by Ignatius in the *Constitutiones lat. et hisp.*, 349-363. Hence they were translated in French by L. MICHEL, S.J., *Hist. de St. Ignace de Loyola*, II. (1893), 392-412.

consists of ten parts, are preceded by an "Examen"; it states what tests the Order applies to those who are to be accepted as members and how the latter for their part test the life of the Order before pledging themselves for ever by its vows.

"The object of this Society," so we are told at the very beginning of the "Examen," is "not only to pursue the salvation and perfecting of the individual soul by God's grace, but, with the help of the latter, to seek zealously the salvation and perfecting of the soul of our neighbour." The same thought recurs in the course of the Constitutions themselves. "The particular object of the Society is this: we wish to help our own souls and the souls of our neighbours to reach the final end for which we have been created." The Society of Jesus is "founded for the greater glory of God, for the highest general good, and the profit of souls."¹

Other Orders had attached to personal sanctification, the common aim of all monastic life, such accessory observances as meditation on divine things, or solemn celebration of worship, or the service of the sick, or other charitable works; in like manner Ignatius set as a special task for his community the salvation and sanctification of others; this would redound to the greater glory of God and to the extension of His kingdom over the whole world under the leadership and through the imitation of Christ. Among the Mendicant Orders, and especially among the Dominicans and Franciscans, preaching and similar agencies had been employed already; but Ignatius had set the salvation of souls more emphatically in the foreground, and had adapted with greater consistence, to this end, the choice of members of the Order, their training and education, and the whole disciplinary system of their lives.

¹ Examen, c. 1, n. 2; Constitutiones, P. 3, c. 1, n. 9; P. 4, proœm.

A repulsive outward appearance, disordered intellect, intractability of character, bad reputation, uncatholic habits of thought were barriers to admission. None also could be admitted who had worn, even if it were only as a novice, the clothing of another Order. "For," said Ignatius, "such a one ought to have remained true to his first vocation."¹ Some were received as "indifferent"; as long as it was uncertain whether they were qualified for the priesthood or fitted for lay brotherhood, they were to hold themselves in readiness for either alternative and submit to be appointed to the one sphere or the other at the discretion of their Superiors.²

The term of probation, in the narrower sense of the word, did not last, as in other Orders, for a term of one but of two years. During this period novices had to undergo various tests; each one had to give a month to the spiritual exercises, to visit the sick in hospitals, and go from door to door on a quest for alms; they had also to attend to the house and do other domestic services. Moreover, they were bound to explain the Catechism, and, if they were priests, to practise themselves in preaching, and in hearing confessions.³

On the expiry of the probationary period it was usual in other orders to proceed at once to the assumption of the solemn vows. In this instance Ignatius made a trenchant alteration. By his rule novices only took

¹ Constitutiones, P. 1., c. 1-4; Examen, c. 2, n. 36. The most recent edition, 3 vols., of the "Institutum Societatis Jesu" (Florentiae, 1892-1893), gives the Constitutions together with the Examen in 2 vols., pp. 1-145. It is the Latin translation in general use in the Order. For the "Institutum," *cf.* Heimbucher, III., 2nd ed., 10, 21, 22. Newest edition of the Constitutiones: Romae, Typ. Vatic., 1908.

² Examen, c. 1, n. 11.

³ *Ibid.*, c. 1, n. 12; c. 4, n. 9-16, 28.

upon them the so-called scholastic vows, namely, the simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, together with the promise to allow themselves at a later period, on the injunction of their Superior, to be incorporated finally into the Order as a professed or formal coadjutor; these final vows, however, were only confirmed after a long and varied probation. In most cases he had to spend yet another year as a scholastic in study; when this was ended, there then remained yet a third year of probation to go through; during this period he had to regain in the "school of the heart" what he might have lost of fervour in the school of learning. Lay brothers were already excluded from the circle of the professed, inasmuch as priests only could assume the solemn vows.¹ The former, however, and generally speaking all who, after the two years' probation, had taken simple vows, had the consolation of knowing that in virtue even of the latter they were sons of the Order in a true and specific sense.²

A large discretion was left to the Superiors of the Order in the matter of dismissing incompetent and unworthy

¹ Examen, c. 1, n. 10; c. 4, n. 16; c. 7, n. 1; Constitutiones, P. 5, c. 1, n. 3; c. 2, n. 1; P. 10, n. 7. For coadjutors, see *supra*, p. 37.

² "Vere et proprie religiosi," thus Gregory XIII. in the Bull "Ascendente Domino" of May 25, 1584, in express terms (Bull., VIII., 461-464). Since the essential portion of the Order, that of the professed, take solemn vows in the canonical sense, the Society of Jesus thus belongs not to "ecclesiastical congregations" but to the religious orders in the strictest acceptation of the words. Pius V. declared in the Brief "Dum indefessae" of July 7, 1571, that the Society was one of the "Ordines Mendicantium" (Bull., VII., 923-926); Gregory XIII., in the Bull before mentioned, calls them "Ordo regularis" (*ibid.*, VIII., 459, 461). The Council of Trent uses the term "Religio Clericorum" (Sess., 25, De reg. et mon., c. 16). It is not a monastic order but an order of regular clergy. For the expression "clericus saecularis Societatis Jesu," see BRAUNSBERGER, III., 743, 744.

members. This too not only in the case of novices but of those under the scholastic vows; on their part certainly the dedication and obligation were binding for life, but the vows were taken on the tacit understanding that their vows were revocable, on valid grounds, by the Order and their membership dissoluble. In certain cases also a professed might be dismissed, and even the General himself.¹

For the spiritual life of each member effectual support was forthcoming; the daily Masses, frequent confession and communion, examination of conscience twice a day, meditation, the recitation of the Rosary, festivals of Our Lady, spiritual reading, private exhortations, and edifying readings during meals.² All who had not become professed or formal coadjutors had to renew their vows twice a year.³ All the members must open their whole conscience to their directors or to the Superior in order to guard against self-deception.⁴ The professed also must be ready, at least once a year, to give an account of the state of their conscience to the Superior.⁵ It must be each one's endeavour to direct his undertakings with a good and pure intention, more from love of God than from hope of reward and fear of punishment.⁶

In order that ambition may be shut out by bolt and bar, it is strongly prohibited to strive for any post of dignity or pre-eminence in the Order. The professed have to take a special vow in this sense, and even to promise to inform on anyone who shall solicit such honours, and the

¹ Constitutiones, P. 2, c. 2, n. 3, 4; c. 3, n. 5, 6 A; P. 5, c. 4 B; P. 9, c. 4, n. 7.

² *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 5, 10, 20, 21; P. 4, n. 3, 4 B; P. 6, c. 3, n. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, P. 4, c. 4, n. 5 D; P. 5, c. 4, n. 6.

⁴ *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 12.

⁵ *Ibid.*, P. 6, c. 1, n. 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 26.

acceptance even of any dignity outside the Order can only be permitted when this is enjoined under pain of sin by one having authority to do so.¹

The love of relations must be pure and spiritual.² "The closer a man draws to God," exhorts Ignatius, "and the more generously he devotes himself to the Divine Majesty, the more generous will he find God to be towards him."³ This magnanimous love of God must be the fundamental law and mainspring of the whole life of the Order; from this as from its source must spring also the desire to draw ever nearer to the Incarnate Son of God on His Cross and to imitate Him in the joyful endurance of suffering and shame.⁴

The scope of the vows of the Order is accurately measured in the Constitutions. In order to avoid any appearance of covetousness, all spiritual functions must be fulfilled without remuneration. Neither the professed nor the formal coadjutors can hold or inherit any personal property; the houses and churches of the professed have no fixed incomes; professed and non-professed alike must support themselves on alms.⁵ On the other hand, colleges and noviciates have fixed incomes whereby the inmates, free from anxieties of subsistence, can devote their whole attention to teaching and learning. Those who have not yet taken the solemn vows can certainly still hold property, but not at their own free disposition; they must also be ready to renounce it before taking the solemn vows, and even earlier still if the Superior should at any time enjoin

¹ Constitutiones, P. 10, n. 6.

² Luke xiv. 26, Matt. xix. 29, Examen, c. 4, n. 7.

³ Constitutiones, P. 3, c. 1, n. 22.

⁴ Examen, c. 4, n. 44; Const. proœm. Cf. FRINS in Wetzer u. Weltes Kirchenlexikon, VI., 2nd ed., 1384.

⁵ Constitutiones, P. 6, c. 2, n. 2-4, 7, 12

them to do so. Without permission of the latter no one can make use of anything or dispose thereof by loan or alienation.¹ Also, as opportunity occurs, each one must practically experience that he is a poor man. Poverty is and always must be the "strong bulwark of the life of the Order"; for that reason all the professed must swear to withstand any alteration of the rules concerning poverty; in such a case it would behove them to make the regulations more severe.²

As regards the vow of chastity, one exhortation is addressed to all "to watch with the utmost care over the doorways of the senses, especially the eyes, ears, and tongue, in order that all that is irregular may be kept at a distance." They must be assiduous in observing silence when this is enjoined, in having regard to reserve and edification when called upon to speak, in maintaining a modest demeanour, a composure of step and bearing in all their movements. "Fasts, vigils, and similar corporal hardships are certainly not to be indulged in immoderately," but also "not so sparingly as to chill the fervour of the spiritual, and inflame the lower and merely human motions of the soul." In private no room must be left for "indolence, the beginning of all vices"; a strict regulation of daily life is therefore necessary.³

Obedience was a primary consideration in the spiritual contingent levied by the knight of Loyola for the army of the Church. His soldiers must be capable of "any task, not openly sinful, however difficult and repugnant to the senses" it may be. They must be trained to exhibit obedience not only where formal obligations command, but

¹ Examen, c. 1, n. 4; c. 4, n. 4; Constitutiones, P. 4, c. 2, n. 5; c. 4 E.

² Constitutiones, P. 3, c. 1, n. 7, 8, 25; P. 6, c. 2, n. 1, 11 A, H.

³ *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 4, 5, 15; c. 2, n. 2; P. 6, c. 3, n. 1.

even on the slightest intimation of their Superior's wish.¹ Commands must be carried out promptly, completely, and perseveringly; yet their fulfilment must not be merely mechanical and external. Ignatius insists repeatedly on conscious, spontaneous, joyful obedience; therefore his subordinates must make "the will and judgment of their Superior the standard measure of their own judgment and will."² In this sense they are to practise a "blind obedience";³ blind not in relation to the thing commanded, but certainly in relation to the deceits and illusions of their own darkness, pettiness of soul, and sensuality.

St. Basil in one of his monastic maxims had once compared obedience to a carpenter's tool:⁴ in like manner Ignatius drew his image from the staff in an old man's hand; he did not even forget to repeat, at least in a few words, the comparison that St. Francis of Assisi had worked out in such detail for his disciples⁵—that the perfectly obedient man resembled an inanimate corpse.⁶

¹ Constitutiones, P. 3, c. 1, n. 23; P. 6, c. 1, n. 1.

² *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 23.

³ The translation has "caeca quadam obedientia," the Spanish original simply "con obedientia ciega" (P. 6, c. 1, n. 1). Francesco Suarez supports this doctrine of blind obedience by many sayings of fathers and teachers of ancient Christendom and of the Middle Ages, and concludes: "Ignatius clearly had either borrowed his teaching from them or at least given expression to it in a like spirit to theirs" (*Tractatus de Religione Societatis Jesu*, l. 4, c. 15, n. 4-11: Opera, ed. CAR. BERTON, XVI., Parisiis, 1866, 778-782). Cf. also DUHR, *Jesuiten-fabeln*, 531-533; HEIMBUCHER, III., 2nd ed., 27; HEINER, *Die Jesuiten*, Munich, 1906, 40-46.

⁴ Constitutiones Monasticae, c. 22, n. 5 (MIGNE, *Patr. Gr.*, XXXI., 1409).

⁵ S. BONAVENTURA, *Legenda (major) S. Francisci*, c. 6 (*Seraphici Doctoris S. Bonaventurae legendae duae de Vita S. Francisci Seraphici, Ad Claras Aquas*, 1898, 90).

⁶ Constitutiones, P. 6, c. 1, n. 1.

In order to attain this perfection we ought, Ignatius warns us, "to have God, our Creator and Lord, before our eyes in order that for His sake a man may render obedience to his fellow-man," "to look upon our Superior whomsoever he be as the representative of Christ," and therefore to give as "prompt obedience to his word" as though it came from the mouth of Christ.¹ At the same time the Constitutions repeatedly concede the right to the subordinate to make counter-representations to the Superior; only they must have been made the subject of previous prayer and be accompanied with the resolve to do, as best, what the Superior finally determines.² Ignatius also adopts the clause in the Dominican Constitutions³ that, the vows of the Order excepted, the regulations of the Order as such do not bind under sin;⁴ in that case the Superior must

¹ Constitutiones, P. 6, c. 1, n. 1; P. 3, c. 1, n. 23. St. Benedict had already taught the same: "Obedientia, quae majoribus praebetur, Deo exhibetur; ipse enim dixit: Qui vos audit me audit" [Lc. 10, 16] (Regula Sancti Patris Benedicti, c. 5, ed. EDM. SCHMIDT, O.S.B., Ratisbonae, 1892, 27, 28). Benedict also describes obedient monks as "voluntatem propriam deserentes," "ambulantes alieno iudicio et imperio" (*ibid.*, 26, 27).

² Examen, c. 8 A; Constitutiones, P. 3, c. 2, n. 1; P. 5, c. 4 F; P. 7, c. 2 J.

³ "Volumus et declaramus ut Constitutiones nostrae non obligent nos ad culpam, sed ad penam, nisi propter preceptum vel contemptum" (Constitutiones Ordinis Praedicatorum, Prologus, recension of St. Raymond of Pennafort, given by P. HEINR. DENIFLE in Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengesch. des Mittelalters, V., 534).

⁴ "Obligat á peccado mortal ni venial": "Obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere" (Constitutiones, P. 6, c. 5). That the expression "obligatio ad peccatum," occurring also in the Franciscan and Dominican rules, does not mean an obligation to commit sin but an obligation incurring sin or "under sin," if violated, is recognized by Ranke, Gieseler, Steitz, Gardiner, and other Protestant scholars and is now pretty generally admitted (*cf.* DUHR, Jesuitenfabeln,⁴ 525, 541).

enjoin something in virtue of obedience. Besides this Superiors can, on good grounds, release a subordinate from the observance of a particular rule.¹

The General of the Society of Jesus, as sketched by Ignatius, ought not to limit himself to the sanctification of those under him, he must aim also at influencing through them the world around. The renunciation of the world did not drive the hero of Pampeluna, as it had driven the other great monastic founders, to silent, sunlit mountain peaks or to caverns hidden from the approach of men; Ignatius went in search of sinners in great cities; he bade his young followers cross the seas to deal blows at heathendom. But as yet most of those who rallied round him were not yet stout enough to fight under his banner; they must first be schooled and trained. To this end therefore the colleges were called into being, and with this aim in view the youthful scions of the Order were here instructed in frequent disputations, trained as preachers and Christian instructors, exercised in literary compositions. None could become professed until he had spent four years in theological study and gone through severe examinations.

The scholastics must have a fund of bodily and spiritual health to draw upon; they were therefore never to be deprived of their needful times of sleep and not to be too much engrossed in household duties, nor were they also to study too long at a stretch or at unsuitable times. Prayers and penitential exercises were not to take up so much of their time as of that of the novices; for, as the Constitutions express it, "God will be as well pleased, indeed better pleased, if with a good intention they serve Him by devotion to those studies which, so to speak, make a claim upon the whole man."² When ordained priests they must

¹ Constituciones, P. 4, c. 10 B; P. 9, c. 3, n. 8 D.

² *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 2, n. 4; P. 4, c. 4, n. 1, 2; c. 6, n. 2, 3.

associate themselves with all the means afforded by the Catholic Church for the fostering of piety: prayer and Holy Mass, the confessional, preaching and catechizing, spiritual exercises, and the labours of the pen. In the vows of the professed and formal coadjutors great stress is laid on the instruction of children in the elements of the Christian faith, since, says Ignatius, in this way "a great help is given to souls and a high service to God."¹

The wide powers conferred by the Holy See on these apostolic workers are to be used with wisdom and discretion and with the wholly unalloyed intention of making them profitable to souls only.² The field of labour was coextensive with the world. Their fourth solemn vow binds the professed to go whithersoever the Pope's word commands them, without even asking him for money for their journey or for any other sort of temporal aid. As often as a new Pope is chosen the General must inform him of this vow and of its scope.³ The General can send all, even the non-professed, to any place and in the performance of any office coming within the purview of the Society. His fundamental principle must be that "the more general a good is, the more divine is its character;" therefore those spheres of spiritual service are to be preferred through which the influence of good may have the widest expansion: bishoprics, principalities, magistracies, seats of learning and universities, and great nations.⁴

Another engine of activity touched more remotely the salvation of souls, and yet in the hands of the Society of Jesus became a powerful lever thereto: this was the

¹ Constitutiones, P. 5, c. 3, n. 3, 6 B; c. 4, n. 2; P. 7, c. 4, n. 2-11.

² *Ibid.*, P. 10, n. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, P. 5, c. 3, n. 3; P. 7, c. 1, n. 1, 3, 8.

⁴ *Ibid.*, P. 7, c. 2 D, E; P. 9, c. 3, n. 9.

education of extern scholars. In the first conception of the founder this had no place; originally his aim was solely to provide seminaries for his own Order. The novices and junior members of the Order had a common dwelling-place in a university city; thence they went to attend the public lectures. Soon the strength of the Order increased so greatly that he was able to think of allowing its offshoots in the colleges to develop their own educational capacities. Finally, at the request of the founders and benefactors, permission was given to receive extern pupils for instruction, or also to take over middle and high schools which were almost exclusively intended for the tuition of externs.¹

On these lines then even at an early period the educational rules of the Constitutions were moving. They embraced the whole system of teaching from the alphabet to the curriculum of the university.² In the front rank of educational functions stood the exegesis of Holy Scripture and the scholastic theology of St. Thomas Aquinas. The sentences of Peter Lombard were at the same time set down for reading. If the exigencies of the time required it, some other theological text-book might be introduced with the consent of the General and on the advice of men of ripe experience; canon law was also taught with the exception of such portions as concerned the practice of legal tribunals;³ civil law and medicine might

¹ FERD. TOURNIER, Mons. Guillaume du Prat au Concile de Trente : *Etudes*, XCVIII. (1904), 477-484.

² These are published in Latin and German by G. M. PACTLER, S.J., in the *Mon. Germ. paed.*, II. : *Ratio studiorum et Institutiones scolasticae Societatis Jesu*, I., Berlin, 1887, 8-69.

³ That is the meaning of the words "sin entrar en la parte de Cánones que sirve para el foro contencioso": "non attingendo tamen eum partem Canonum, quae foro contentioso inservit" (P. 4, c. 12, n. 1). Gothein's explanation is incorrect: "that Ignatius also thought

be taken up by extern pupils ; in philosophy Aristotle was master. The collegiate course consisted of five classes : three for grammar, followed by humanity and rhetoric. Together with Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, Arabic, the Indian and other languages might be studied where this would be of use ; mathematics and history were not to be omitted, and instruction in reading and writing was a labour of love which the Order in no way excluded.¹ To pass Master in the liberal arts three years and a half must be given to philosophy ; for the doctor's degree in theology it was required that the customary four years of study should be supplemented by another two. Promotions were free of charge, and entertainments on taking the doctor's degree forbidden on account of the expense.²

Higher value was attached to the moral discipline of youth. The works of classical authors, therefore, were purged of unseemly passages and expressions. A book unobjectionable in itself but by an author of bad repute was not to be used as a school-book, otherwise an attraction might be felt towards the author and admiration for what he says rightly be transferred to those things which he asserts wrongly. Where laziness and bad habits do not give way to persuasion bodily punishment must ensue ; but the chastisement must never be given by a fellow-member of the Order. All scholars, even the University students, ought to go to confession at least once a month ; they must also attend Mass daily, hear a sermon every Sunday, go once a week to the explanation of the Catechism, and also listen once a week to an edifying discourse in Latin which one of the scholars shall be appointed to deliver.

that many parts of the canon law were of no use save for fostering a spirit of litigation" (p. 441).

¹ Constitutiones, P. 4, c. 12, n. 1, 2, 4 A, B, C ; c. 14, n. 1, 3 B, C.

² *Ibid.*, P. 4, c. 15, n. 2, 3, 4 F.

The teachers, in and out of hours of instruction, shall avail themselves of every opportunity to stimulate in their pupils a love of God's service and of virtue.¹ For scholars belonging to the Society itself a special course of study must be drawn up with the General's approval; in this attention must be given to the requirements of time and place. Besides, each college is to have its own regulations going more fully into details.² In this part of the Constitutions, as in all the rest, to the rules are often added the words "as far as this is possible." The "when" and "how" are constantly committed to the wise discretion of the Superior.³ It is evident that the educational rules of the Constitutions were copied from those obtaining in Paris, where Ignatius and his first comrades had studied.⁴

The working of the Society must, despite its complexity and great local expansion, maintain its characteristic of unity. Of service for this was the correlated distribution of the Society into a varied membership of novices, scholastics, lay brothers, ecclesiastical coadjutors, and professed, with their hierarchical order and dependence, as well as the combination of individual houses into provinces and of these into assistances under one common head. The functions of obedience and command ascend in an ordered series of succession from the subordinates upwards through the immediate, mediate, and highest authorities, and *vice versa* from the latter downwards. The Provincial must make frequent visitation of the houses.⁵

¹ Constituciones, P. 4, c. 5 E; c. 7, n. 2; c. 14, n. 2 A; c. 16, n. 1-5.

² *Ibid.*, P. 4, c. 7, n. 2; c. 13 A.

³ *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 15, 18, 21 B, C, F, I, R; c. 2, n. 1, 5 E, G; P. 4, c. 4 A; c. 6 A; c. 15 C-F; P. 6, c. 2 M; c. 3 A.

⁴ More fully in B. DUHR, S.J., Die Studienordnung der Gesellschaft Jesu: Bibl. der kathol. Pädagogik, IX., Freiburg i. Br., 1896, 3-5.

⁵ Constituciones, P. 8, c. 1, n. 4 J.

The secret *par excellence* of the powerful solidarity of the Jesuit Order lies in the supreme authority of the General. Chosen by the general assemblage of the Order, he alone among all the officers holds his office for life; he it is who has power to admit all and to dismiss all, who nominates and removes not only the provincials but also all rectors of the novitiates and the colleges,¹ who dispenses spiritual powers and graces, limits them and recalls them, who convenes and presides over the general assemblies of the Order. To him every third year each province of the Order must send a confidential member to report to him on the condition of the province. In difficult affairs indeed the General must attend to the counsel of the Assistants, about four in number, given him as assessors by the general assembly, but their counsel has not binding power.² Yet on the other hand again, this supreme authority in the Order is moderated not only by the divine and ecclesiastical commandments but also by the Constitutions of the Society itself; their alteration belongs only to the General Congregation of the Order. This highest tribunal is composed of the General, his Assistants, the Provincials, and each couple of professed chosen in each province by a Provincial Congregation consisting of the Provincial, the Rectors, and the rest of the professed. The General Congregation also alone has the right to dissolve a college. The General is recommended to give a wide scope for the activity of his subordinate officers. It is the duty of his Assistants to watch over his personal tasks;

¹ At first Ignatius allowed or commanded, from time to time, the members of a house to elect their own Superior—such was the case in Gandia (letter to them, dat. Rome, July 29, 1547; Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 560).

² Constituciones, P. 4, c. 10, n. 3; c. 17, n. 1; P. 8, c. 2 B.; P. 9, c. 1, n. 1 A; c. 3, n. 1-17; c. 6, n. 10, 11.

they must take care that he does not injure his health through too severe a manner of life or through excess of exertion. Further, the Order sets beside him an Admonitor, who, whether he be likewise chosen by the General as his confessor or not, has in case of necessity to call his attention to faults in his behaviour or in the conduct of his office. It is also the Assistants' duty to take care that a General who is incapable of work or is unworthy of his place should be provided with a coadjutor or a successor.¹

A second unifying tie in the Order is brotherly love. A common system of life, uniformity of doctrine in sermons, lectures and writings, mutual discussion in Provincial and General assemblies bind their hearts together. "In their ceremonies" the Society "shall, so far as it is practicable in different localities, follow the Roman usage, as this is the more general and is in a more particular way adopted by the Apostolic See." The officers shall in their commands show good-will, modesty, and charity, so that their rule shall be more by love than by fear. The Provincials and Rectors must always have certain members of the Order marked out for them with whom in matters of importance they can consult even if the decision rests entirely in their own hands.²

Ignatius showed exceptional skill in turning correspondence into an instrument wherewith to direct the Order and cement its unity. Frequently, at appointed times, the General must receive reports from the Provincials and Rectors, the Provincials from the Rectors, and the latter from those whose work lies outside the houses, to all of whom, in return, replies and instructions must be sent.

¹ Constitutiones, P. 4, c. 2, n. 3; c. 10, n. 2; P. 8, c. 2, n. 2; c. 4, n. 1; P. 9, c. 4, n. 1-7; c. 5, n. 3; c. 6, n. 2; P. 10, n. 8.

² *Ibid.*, P. 3, c. 1, n. 18; P. 4, c. 8, n. 2; P. 8, c. 1, n. 8 G; P. 9, c. 6, n. 14.

Moreover, in each house of the Order an account must be given of anything consolatory or edifying that has been reported from the rest. To serve this purpose, at appointed times letters are set in circulation. Thus mutual remembrance is maintained, the different fields of labour are passed in review, lessons are learned from the experiences of others, comfort is afforded in moments of misfortune, and the spur applied to a noble emulation.¹

The originality of the founder of the Society of Jesus was displayed not merely in his choice of new weapons but in his rejection of old methods of warfare. Nothing was further from his thought than a desire to subjugate the world ; his only purpose was to supply the Papacy with a band of auxiliary troops always ready to march and easy to handle in the defence and extension of the Church. For this reason the men of the Order were never to be hampered by the episcopal staff or tied down to one fixed spot by the regular direction of women's souls. After giving in the Constitutions solid guarantees for the inner life of the individual members, Ignatius felt that, for the sake of the tasks set before them, many external means of protection, which for centuries had been of the greatest blessing and service to the religious orders, must be cast aside. Among them was the special dress of the orders. To the enemies of the Church the monk's garment was an abomination ; nor was this all : stained by the immoral and renegade, the habit even in many Catholic districts was more likely to find doors and hearts closed against it than opened to receive it. Ignatius ruled that his followers should wear the dress of the countries in which they were living ; at the same time they were always to be mindful of respectability and poverty.² Also in their keep and

¹ Constituciones, P. 8, c. 1, n. 9 L, M.

² *Ibid.*, P. 6, c. 2, n. 15.

the other external observances of life they were to conform to local customs without being bound by a general rule to observe special fasts and other acts of penance; in the practice of the latter they were rather to be guided each one by the direction of their confessor or superior.¹

In the same spirit Ignatius also took another bold step which the founders of the Theatine Order had not yet ventured upon, and for which ten years after his death he was still unforgiven by many pious and learned men. Strongly attracted as he was personally to the solemn observance of the Church prayers in choir,² he yet released his Order entirely from this practice in order that the work of preaching, hearing confessions, and giving instruction might meet with no impediment; those who wish to seek edification in prayer in choir could find, he said, churches enough wherein to satisfy their wishes.³

It would seem that the founder of the Society of Jesus in all these regulations had before his eyes the saying of St. Thomas Aquinas: "Strictness in external things is not the main point in the life of an Order. . . . That Order does not stand highest which exceeds others in strictness in externals, but which in the external ordering of its life adapts itself most reasonably to the special object for which it exists."⁴ A computation has been made of the number of times in which in his Constitutions Ignatius makes use of the phrases "to the greater glory of God," "to the greater service of God," and such and

¹ Constitutiones, P. 3, c. 1, n. 15; P. 6, c. 2, n. 16; c. 3, n. 1.

² Cf. RIBADENEIRA, De actis, etc., n. 29 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 348).

³ Constitutiones, P. 6, c. 3, n. 4.

⁴ S. theol., 2, 2, q. 188, a. 6 ad 3. P. HEINR. DENIFLE, O.P., has some excellent remarks on the Jesuit system in his work: Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwicklung, I., Mainz, 1904, 175-179.

similar expressions are found to occur in more than two hundred and fifty places.¹ The Constitutions are the shafts of light which irradiated from his soul, and his soul was filled with love—the love of God and of his neighbour. If in his Exercises Ignatius revealed himself as a great director of souls, in his Constitutions he appears as a great lawgiver to his Order.²

A great opportunity for vindicating this zeal for God's glory occurred to the Order at the end of 1545, when the Council of Trent was opened. Ignatius had placed Le Jay at the disposal of the Bishop of Augsburg, Cardinal Otto von Truchsess, who appointed him his procurator at Trent in December 1545. Le Jay had his seat by the Bishop's side, although only with a consultative voice.³ He was one of the two to whom, on the 23rd of February 1546, the first draft of the decree on the Holy Scriptures and tradition was entrusted.⁴ With Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, Prince-Bishop of Trent, he stood on a footing of great confidence.⁵ But the Pope himself also wished to send some Jesuits to Trent. Ignatius had

¹ Acta Sanctorum, Julii, VII., n. 677.

² VICTOR NAUMANN (Pilatus) says: "The constitution of the Society is a masterpiece of art which does high honour to its inventor" (Der Jesuitismus, Regensburg, 1905, 95). Cf. also BUSS, I., 554-594.

³ The mandate (dated Dillingen, Dec. 1, 1545) whereby provost Andreas Rem von Kötzt and Claude Le Jay were appointed procurators is given by EHSSES (Conc. Trid., IV., 1, 440-442; cf. *ibid.*, 540). Rem remained only a short time in Trent.

⁴ Notes of the promoter of the Council, Ercole Severoli, and diaries of the secretary of the Council, Angelo Massarelli, in MERKLE, Conc. Trid., I., i., 3, 33, 88, 93, 105, 352, 430, 592. Cf. also Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 302.

⁵ So Canisius in his autograph notes in RIBADENEIRA'S Life of the saint, Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 719.

to select them; he named Faber, Laynez, and Salmeron.¹ Faber, however, died soon after at Rome. From the instructions which the General gave them for their conduct at Trent we see that the care of souls was to be a primary consideration. In preaching they were to avoid exposition of the doctrines on which the Protestants were at variance with the Catholics; their sermons and instructions were to end with a prayer for the Council. In speaking they were to be very cautious and unassuming.²

From the presidents of the assembly, the Cardinal-Legates del Monte and Cervini, Laynez and Salmeron met with a very cordial greeting—their reception by the bishops was not so warm; the Spanish prelates in particular were almost ashamed of the youth and shabby clothes of their fellow-countrymen.³ The latter made haste to visit the poor, who had been gathered together in a house outside the city. On alternate days Laynez, Salmeron, and Le Jay went thither and said Mass, expounded the cardinal doctrines of the Faith, and administered the Sacraments.⁴ “With great matters,” they wrote conjointly to Ignatius on the 4th of June 1546, “we do not mix ourselves up beyond what is imposed upon us by our duties.”⁵ They had no respite from work; all bishops and divines at Trent were forbidden to preach in public; at the request, however, of some of the Fathers, Laynez was ordered by the Cardinal-Legates to occupy the pulpit, and he preached to great congregations on Sundays and feast-days in

¹ Ignatius to Francis·Borgia, dat. Rome, April 23, 1546; Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 381.

² The reference in Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., 386–389.

³ ORLANDINUS, l. 6, n. 21, 23.

⁴ POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 128. Cf. note 1, *loc. cit.*, 388, 389.

⁵ Epistolae P. Alphonsi Salmeronis, Societatis Jesu ex autographis vel originalibus exemplis potissimum depromptae, a Patribus ejusdem Societatis nunc primum editae, I., Matriti, 1906, 16.

S. Maria Maggiore.¹ Before this the Legates had already bidden him and Salmeron take part² in the gatherings of theologians, who were not Fathers of the Council—the so-called lesser theologians,—in which divines of the first rank from different countries discussed before Cardinals and bishops the burning questions of the hour. Here Laynez and Salmeron dealt with the question of justification with such soundness and learning that many members of the Council asked them for copies of these disquisitions.³ Laynez refuted Seripando's view of "imputed justice" in a treatise which threw light on the whole question.⁴

Peter Canisius, who was appointed in February 1547 by Cardinal Truchsess as an assistant theologian to Le Jay, wrote from Trent to Rome: "Other theologians have barely an hour to speak in; but Laynez was allowed by the Cardinal-President to speak for three hours and even longer."⁵ The Bishop of Foligno declared a year later that none had expressed themselves at Trent so clearly and intelligibly as Laynez and Salmeron.⁶ From justification the discussion passed to the Sacraments;

¹ Ignatius to Torres, dat. Rome, Oct. 9, 1546 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 435); POLANCUS, I., n. 131; Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis, I., 16.

² Laynez and companions to Ignatius, dat. Trent, June 4, 1546 (Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis, I., 15, 16).

³ Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Trent, July 3, 1546 (Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti, 310 *seq.*); *cf.* the diaries of Massarelli in MERKLE, I., 459, 461, 463, 580, 605, 609, 610, 615.

⁴ *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. 8, c. 11, n. 9. The treatise is given by HARTM. GRISAR, S.J.: *Jacobi Lainez Disputationes Tridentinae*, II., Oeniponte, 1886, 153-192. Theiner's edition is faulty.

⁵ BRAUNSBERGER, I., 245.

⁶ Silvestro Landini to Ignatius, dat. Foligno, Dec. 1548 (Litterae quadrimestres, I., Matriti, 1894, 124); *cf.* also Ignatius to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, Aug. 19, 1546 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 413).

Layneze and Salmeron were instructed by the Legates to summarize the errors of the Protestants and the contrary statements of Fathers and Councils. Cardinal Cervini presented this work to the Fathers as a basis for the negotiations.¹ Salmeron, in the middle of July 1546, in a letter meant only for the General himself, stated: "The doctrine of some of the theologians is bad; Cardinal Cervini therefore takes care that in the meetings of theologians one of us is among the first speakers and explains the subject; the other is kept in reserve for the end; it is his special business to refute the less correct opinions that have been expressed. Almost all the bishops, Italian, Spanish, and French, are on our side; and among the Spaniards those who at first were most against us now speak openly in our praise, invite us to their tables, and impart to us what they intend to say in the congregations. . . . Many learned prelates come to us before the congregations to consult us about their votes. Others who are better versed in other subjects than theology receive our instruction willingly and thoroughly. Cardinal Cervini gives us his entire confidence."²

At the beginning of 1547 Ignatius, at the request of the Duchess of Tuscany, wished to send Laynez to Florence; but Cardinal Cervini declared that he was indispensable, and Bishop Archinto, the Vicar of Paul III., wrote to the General that his sons could not do more good at any place in the world than at Trent.³ When in March

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 459, 604, 605; Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Trent, Jan. 30, 1547 (*Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti*, 333); POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 177.

² *Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis*, I., 26, 27; *cf.* also ORLANDINUS, I. 6, n. 25, and ASTRAIN, I., 526, 527.

³ BARTOLI, *Istoria della Comp. P' Italia*, I. 2, c. 4 (*Opere V.*, Torino, 1825, 35-38). *Cf.* TACCHI VENTURI in *Civ. Catt.*, Ser. XVIII., vii (1899), 156-166.

1547 the transference of the Council to Bologna was decided on, Laynez and Salmeron were also sent there by the Legates. Le Jay and Canisius wrote repeatedly to Cardinal Truchsess, to whom the removal was highly displeasing, and asked for instructions. As the reply was long in coming, they betook themselves to Bologna as Ignatius had ordered. At last Le Jay received from Truchsess the hint not to appear as his procurator in Bologna: he was now a simple theologian.¹ Although the assembly at Bologna was, owing to the Emperor's opposition, only a troublesome waste of time, the Jesuits stayed there a considerable time. Laynez spoke for three consecutive hours on the sacrament of penance; Canisius also sometimes spoke. The secretary of the Council, Massarelli, wrote in his diary on the 15th of May 1547: "This afternoon I was with Messers Claudius, Jacobus, and Alphonsus, of the Society of Jesus, and showed them the censures and opinions on the Canons on the Eucharist; we conversed for four hours over these opinions. I then drew up my report of this for my very honourable masters." Salmeron in November 1547 was still working for the Council.²

These exertions were also of advantage to the Society. Bishop Guillaume du Prat of Clermont came to the conviction that the Jesuits would be of service to the Church

¹ "Alias Tridenti procurator R^{mi} Otthonis cardinalis Augustensis" (Massarelli on the assembly of theologians of May 6, 1547: *Diarium*, IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 649; *cf.* also *ibid.*, 670); Letter from Truchsess to Le Jay, dat. Dillingen, April 18, 1547 (*Epistolae Mixtae*, I., 356, 357); POLANCUS, n. 177.

² Massarelli, *Diarium*, IV., *loc. cit.*, 644-649, 652, 660, 671-674, 679, 683; BRAUNSBERGER, I., 684, 685; Salmeron to Ignatius, dat. Bologna, Nov. 26, 1547 (*Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis*, I., 59); ORLANDINUS, l. 7, n. 24. *Cf.* also GUI. BOERO, S.J., *Vito del Servo di Dio P. Giacomo Lainez*, Firenze, 1880, 70-75.

of France, and resolved to found two colleges for them, one in Paris, the other in Billom. Many other bishops also expressed a wish to have some Jesuits in their sees. The Bishop of Badajoz sent very favourable reports to the Spanish court of Laynez and his colleagues at Trent. He also sent Salmeron's printed sermon to the council of the Inquisition as the best that had been delivered on the Council. The Inquisitors were much pleased with it. "Thus," wrote the Provincial Araoz from Madrid to Rome, "others have done more for us by their speeches than we have ourselves with all the sweat of our brows in Spain."¹

Venice was the first city, with the exception of Rome, in which the Jesuits found a foothold. The Venetian patrician Andrea Lippomano offered the young members sent to study at Padua by Ignatius a residence in the priory of the Teutonic Order belonging to him there; he soon went a step further and without any solicitation declared himself ready, with the Pope's permission, to assign this benefice entirely to the Society. Paul III. ordered an investigation of the circumstances to be made, and then as supreme administrator of the property of the Church ordained that the priorate of Padua should be set apart for the maintenance of two houses of students of the Society of Jesus, one to be established in Padua and another in Venice.² Philip, the Spanish heir-apparent, wrote to the Doge that the priorate might certainly be

¹ Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Trent, May 10, 1546 (Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti, 307-309); Salmeron to Ignatius, dat. Trent, Sept. 30, 1546 (Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis, I., 29); Araoz to Ignatius, dat. April 24, 1547 (Epistolae Mixtae, I., 359); ORLANDINUS, l. 6, n. 30; SOMMERVOGEL, VII., 478, 479.

² Ferron, S.J., to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, Nov. 21, 1545 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 330). Report on the Society of Jesus, 1547, sent from Italy to the court of Charles V. (Const. Soc. Jesu lat. et hisp., 347, 348); POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 37, 51, 86.

given to the Jesuits and every favour be generally shown to them, as he knew them to be men of zealous, learned, and edifying conversation.¹ When the vote was afterwards taken in the Senate there was also a very large majority in their favour.²

In compliance with their desire Laynez was sent to the Venetians by Paul III., and together with other duties he gave lectures thrice a week on St. John's Gospel. Cardinal Cervini succeeded in securing for a while the services of Pascal Broët for his native place, Montepulciano. In Verona, Salmeron, sent thither by Ignatius on the invitation of the learned and pious Bishop Luigi Lippomano, preached on Sundays to the people on the Epistle to the Romans. To another very learned bishop, the Dominican, Ambrogio Catarino, Bobadilla was given for his see of Minori.³

In Faenza, Lutheran teaching had been disseminated by the apostate General of the Capuchins, Ochino; moreover, in the city and throughout the whole Romagna many vendettas existed, some of which had been handed down for more than a century; assassinations constantly ensued. There Broët appeared and in seven schools of the city gave Christian instruction; his sermons produced such an effect that on one occasion more than a hundred persons were at the same time solemnly reconciled. He also founded the *Compagnia della Carità* for the purpose of seeking out the sick poor, moving them to confess and receive communion, and providing for their nourishment and medical aid.⁴

¹ *Epistolae Mixtae*, I., 570, 571.

² RIBADENEIRA, *De actis*, etc., n. 52. Cf. K. SCHELLHASS in *Quellen und Forschungen VII.*, 91-120. The later attempts of the German Order to cancel the transfer were ineffectual.

³ POLANCUS, 43, 50, 235, 238, 391, 393.

⁴ Broët to Francis Xavier, dat. Faenza, March 1, 1545, and to Ignatius, dat. Faenza, Nov. 1, 1545 (*Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti*, 34-37); POLANCUS, n. 910.

Belluno underwent a like transformation. Attendance upon sermons had dropped out of practice; un-Catholic views on confession, purgatory, and the saints were diffused. In 1549 Bishop Giulio Contarini made an arrangement with Ignatius that Salmeron should come to Belluno, and in that year the Sacraments were frequented by nearly a thousand more persons than in the year before; Lutheran books, translated into Italian, were cast into the fire; the city made public declaration that Salmeron had wrought a new birth and total renovation.¹

The first beginnings of the Order in Modena were less fortunate. The academy in that city had a reputation of years' standing as a centre of error and free thought. As early as 1536 and 1539 Paul III. had taken serious steps to remedy the evil. In 1543 the bishop of the city, the noble, peace-loving Cardinal Morone, invited Salmeron to fill the pulpit of the Cathedral. He began a course of sermons; the members of the academy soon began to accuse him of caustic and acrimonious allusions. Morone having returned home in the meantime heard one of the sermons himself. He received the impression that in it the good works had been rated too highly, and made representations to Salmeron on the subject. The quick-tempered Spaniard made a reply which was somewhat disrespectful; thereupon the Cardinal, as he expressed himself later on, got rid of his man upon the spot.² When, fourteen years afterwards, Morone was imprisoned in St. Angelo by Paul IV. on suspicion of heresy, this brush with Salmeron formed

¹ Salmeron to Ignatius, dat. Venice, April 27, 1549 (Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis, I., 74-77); Peter Schorich, S.J., to Leonhard Kessel, dat. Rome, May 14, 1549 (HANSEN, 152, 153); POLANCUS, n. 429, 430.

² POLANCUS, n. 50, 66; Salmeron to Ignatius, dat. Bologna, Sept 24, 1547 (Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis, I., 52, 53); CANTÙ, Eretici, II., 172, and specially TACCHI VENTURI, I., 533 *seqq.*

one of the points of the indictment. The magnanimous Cardinal, however, was not diverted by this misadventure from his leaning towards the Jesuits; their college at Modena was the outcome of his insistence.¹

One of the great supporters of the innovators in religion was Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, wife of Duke Ercole II., a French princess deeply implicated in Calvinistic teaching. Her husband's confessor, the archdeacon Guido Guidoni of Modena, therefore made use of a favourable hour to warn the former that he, who had so many counsellors at his disposal for the government of his temporal affairs, should at least have the assistance of one man to be his exhorter and helper in the things that concerned his salvation. Ercole assented, and ordered the Pope to be asked to send to him Le Jay, whom Ignatius instructed, while in Ferrara, to look upon the Duke as his true and only superior. Le Jay came and took up his abode in the hospital; the Duke, in whom Ignatius was deceived, troubled himself, however, very little about him. It was reported that Ercole had said that he did not wish to have anything to do with Theatines, as he had no wish to be called one himself.² Le Jay, at the Pope's orders, went in 1549 to Germany.

The favourable prospects of the erection of a college in Florence were destroyed in 1547 by the young Polanco. The General had commissioned him to carry spiritual aid to the people of Florence under the direction of

¹ ORLANDINUS, l. 12, n. 17. Morone in 1563, after his appointment as first President of the Council of Trent, declared to the General, Laynez, that he was ready to shed his blood for the Society (BRAUNSBERGER, IV., 978).

² Ignatius to Le Jay, dat. Rome, 1547, beginning of August (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 569); Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Ferrara, 1547, summer or autumn (Epistolae P. Pasch., Broëti, 336-338; cf. *ibid.*, 394, 395); POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 182.

the Duke and the Archbishop of that city; he, however, was carried away by such excess of zeal that he attempted to enforce written advice on the Duke Cosimo and the Duchess Eleanora, instructing them how to reform their life and government; this gave grievous offence at court. Ignatius gave him severe reproof: "Such a course," he wrote, "can only then be undertaken when the sympathy, confidence, and esteem of such high rulers has been secured"; Polanco must now try and remove the soreness he had caused by services to the sick in the hospitals and similar exhibitions of a humble spirit.¹ Laynez indeed appeared, at the wish of the Duchess, in 1548, and on the Sundays in Lent preached to concourses of 8000 to 9000 persons in the Duomo; but it was not until 1551 that the college was able to make a beginning.²

The Society had to face an actual outburst of storm in Parma, where the opposition was led by a member of a religious order. The principal cause of offence was the frequency of communion introduced by the missionaries; in particular much comment was passed on the conduct of Giulia Zerbinì, a woman of high position and great piety, who not only practised the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius herself, but gave them to friends of her own sex. She received communion during a sickness every day and, it was said, on those days on which she received the Lord's Body she took no other food. The judicial investigation instituted by the

¹ Attempts have been made recently to show from this circumstance that Ignatius had lax notions of the duties of a Court confessor (DRUFFEL, *Ignatius von Loyola*, 17, 18, 32; GOTHEIN, 340). On the other hand, see reply of W. Kreiten: "If Ignatius displayed laxity on this occasion, then laxity must be a characteristic of reason itself" (*Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, XLIX. [1895], 543).

² POLANCUS, n. 233; ORLANDINUS, I., 11, n. 11-24; ED. FUETER, *Das erste Auftreten der Jesuiten in Florenz: Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXVIII. (1907), 432-453.

Bishop of Parma, Cardinal Guido Ascanio Sforza, led on the 30th of December 1543 to a complete acquittal of the Jesuits.¹

In the Jesuit, Silvestro Landini, Italy then possessed a missionary of the first rank. A priest of Casola wrote of him to Ignatius: "When he, accompanied by five or six ecclesiastics to whom he had given the Exercises, went through the country, the people in the fields laid down implements of work, left their oxen, and came running up to them, sometimes ten, twenty, thirty at a time, begging them to hear their confessions." The town of Correggio had for more than twenty years been rent by feuds, two parties, a French and an Italian, were opposed; on one occasion, within a short time five-and-forty men were slain, nothing was spoken of but murder and revenge, and men even came to church carrying weapons. Landini by his preaching made an entire change; arms were flung away, and all—women, children, the aged—exclaimed, "Peace, peace." With sobs and entreaties for forgiveness they fell into one another's arms; some hundred went at the same time to the Sacraments.²

From Castiglione in the Lunigiana the magistrate Baldassare Turiano wrote to Ignatius on the 27th of November 1547 begging that "Padre Silvestro" might not be sent elsewhere. "He makes peace between relatives, between neighbours, between communities; he induces runaway monks to return to their convent; he stirs men up to give means of subsistence to convents and to the poor; he procures rules against profane swearing and for the reverent observance of Sunday; he preaches in churches and public places, explains the Catechism, exhorts men to enter the religious life; he fasts daily, his food is a coarse

¹ *Epistolae Mixtae*, I., 584; *ORLANDINUS*, I. 2, n. 76.

² Reports from Casola and Correggio to Ignatius of 1549 (*Litterae quadrimestres*, I., 161–163, 178–180).

bread of millet seed, his drink a little water. Great and small model their lives on his; even if he were not to preach, his example alone would be a constant sermon." Six months later Raffaello Augustini reports from Fivizzano: "Padre Landini has been with us for about three weeks. He imitates the Apostles and other saints of the primitive church, being ever occupied in prayer, preaching, penance, and works of charity. He is making great efforts to banish hence the plague of Lutheranism, which has forced its way from Lucca into the diocese of Luni." After some months' work in Foligno, the Bishop of the see, the Benedictine, Isidoro Chieri, gave his testimony in the words, "We thought that an angel from heaven and not a human being was dwelling among us."¹ Also in Bologna, Brescia, Naples, Pisa, Pistoja, Reggio, and other cities Jesuit missionaries were welcomed. They often tried to give some perpetuity to their work by forming confraternities of the Blessed Sacrament, associations of women for the protection of penitents of their own sex, and similar communities.²

The first Jesuit to set foot in Sicily was a native of the Netherlands, Jacob Lhoost; he had been sent by Cardinal Rodolfo Pio to his diocese of Girgenti. Laynez, at the bidding of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, brought reforms into the Archdiocese of Monreale; in the cathedral he delivered lectures on the Book of Ecclesiastes. Jeronimo Doménech came in May 1547 to the capital Palermo; he became confessor to the viceroy Juan de Vega and his

¹ *Epistolae Mixtae*, I., 445, 446, 497, 498; *Litterae quadrimestres*, I., 156. Cf. also BARTOLI, S.J., *Degli uomini e de' fatti della Compagnia di Gesù: Opera postuma*, I., Torino, 1847, 196-217.

² The Jesuits, like Paul III., were instrumental in spreading throughout Italy the confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament (cf. TACCHI VENTURI, I., 194 *seqq.*).

wife, restored order to a convent of female penitents which had fallen into the most neglected condition, worked hard for the erection of orphanages for boys and girls, and had a catechism printed for the schools of the island. The Bishop of Patti, Sebastiano de Aragon, Inquisitor for Sicily and one of the foremost men in the kingdom, went through the Spiritual Exercises, together with his vicar and chaplains. At the request of the viceroy, Ignatius in 1549 procured a brief from Paul III. ordering the reformation of the Sicilian convents of nuns. In the same year a college of the Society was opened in Palermo.¹

A year earlier Palermo's mercantile rival, the rich city of Messina, had received a similar institution in answer to requests addressed to Paul III. and to Ignatius. It was the first of the Order which from its beginning and primarily was set apart for the education of extern scholars. The General wished to make of it a typical specimen. His choice of the first teachers was characteristic; they included a Spaniard, an Italian, a German, a Frenchman, and a Savoyard; before they left Rome they were put through the test of giving instructions before him. He then sent the ten, who had been selected for Messina, to the Pope to ask his blessing; their spokesman was Peter Canisius. The Pope gave an extempore address which lasted half an hour, full of affection for Sicily and the Society of Jesus. Jeronimo Nadal, the first rector, gradually modelled the college on the plan of Paris, where he had himself studied.²

¹ BRAUNSBERGER, I., 193, 198; Doménech to Ignatius, dat. Palermo, 1547, July 4, and 1548 (*Litterae quadrimestres*, I., 47-53, 131); Nadal to Ignatius, dat. Messina, July 1549 (*Epist. P. H. Nadal*, I., 67); POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 193-200, 242, 373, 379; ORLANDINUS, I, 7, n. 19; l. 9, n. 27.

² Cf. EMMAN. AGUILERA, S.J., *Provinciae Siculae Societatis Jesu ortus et res gestae ab a. 1546 ad a. 1611, Panormi, 1737, 7-13.*

In the autumn of the year 1548 a new scheme of studies was extended throughout Sicily, and also in Calabria. The scholars showed great diligence; as an efficient means of moral discipline frequent confession proved its influence among them. Messina was so delighted with the new school that already in 1548 it ventured to apply to the Pope for powers to change the collegiate system into that of an university. The time for that, however, had not yet come, and the hopes which the founder of the Order had built on this foundation were not fully realized, but the work in Palermo and Messina bore continuous fruit. "The whole of Sicily," wrote Canisius, "is in the grip of a moral renovation."¹

The first among all the disciples of Loyola to enter on Spanish ground was one of his relations, Antonio Araoz, who had joined the Society in Rome. His arrival was at the end of 1539, when he preached in various places with success. He himself informed Ignatius how on the Holy Cross day of 1540, the pulpit had to be erected for him in the open air near Azpeitia; over 4000 men had come to hear him; many climbed to the roof of the church or the branches of trees in order to have a better hearing.² In 1541 Peter Faber came to Spain; in the

¹ Canisius to Kessel and Adriani, dat. Rome, Feb. 8, 1548, and Messina, Aug. 12, 1548 (BRAUNSBERGER, I., 265, 284); Report of the Jesuits in Rome to those of Louvain, dat. Rome, March 19, 1548 (HANSEN, 116-118); Polanco to Araoz, dat. Rome, March 27, 1548, and Ignatius to Doménech, dat. Rome, April 7, 1548 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., II., 51, 52, 75); Nadal to Ignatius, dat. Messina, May 7, 1549 (Epist. P. H. Nadal, I., 57); Vita P. Cornelii Vishavaei (*ibid.*, IV., 875); POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 231, 243, 244, 339, 350; F. MEYER, Die Missionspläne des Ignatius von Loyola: Histor. Zeitschr., CI., 237-252.

² Vergara, dat. July 4, 1540 (Epist. Mixtae, I., 47); cf. ASTRAIN, I., 205, 230 *seq.*

following year he was in Germany, and in 1544 went from there to Portugal, where he met Araoz. Soon, bearing with them letters of recommendation from King John III. of Portugal, they both made their way to Valladolid to the court of the Spanish heir-apparent, Philip. There they found powerful patrons in Cardinal Juan Tavera, in the Grand Inquisitor Diego Tavera, and in the Papal nuncio Giovanni Poggio, who undertook the maintenance of the Fathers.¹ On Prince Philip removing his court to Madrid Araoz was frequently resident there. He defended earnestly the practice of frequent communion, which many at that time regarded as unpermissible and stigmatized as a Jesuit invention; he also laboured with success at the moral renovation of the convents of women of Catalonia. At Philip's request Ignatius, in concert with the Spanish ambassador in Rome, had obtained from Paul III. the requisite instructions and faculties.²

In 1547 Araoz was appointed by Ignatius first Provincial of the Society in Spain. Within two years a college was started at Valladolid; the house which was assigned to the Fathers was fitted up by the nuncio Poggio at his own expense. Between 1544 and 1546 colleges also arose in Valencia, Gandia, Barcelona, and Alcalà.³ Hostility, however, was not wanting. This was no subject of alarm to Ignatius, on the contrary, he felt cause for depression when the colleges enjoyed long intervals of peace; for then he began to fear that the zeal of the Society might be

¹ POLANCUS, I., n. 33, 143, 266; ORLANDINUS, l. 5, n. 64, 65; ASTRAIN, I., 235, 242.

² Philip to Ignatius, dat. Monzon, Aug. 18, 1547; Polanco to Araoz, dat. Rome, Oct. 31, 1547; Araoz to Polanco, dat. Barcelona, Jan. 12, 1549 (Epist. Mixtae, I., 395, 396; II., 37, 38; Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., I., 612, 613).

³ POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 264; ASTRAIN, I., 265-278.

languishing.¹ In Saragossa the Prior of the Dominicans did his utmost towards the foundation of a Jesuit college; the Viceroy, the Inquisitors, the civic council, and many notables were on his side, but the Carmelites, Franciscans, and Augustinians joined hands with the local clergy and for a time made the execution of the scheme impossible.² The new Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, Juan Martinez Siliceo, was also unfavourable to the Society; he issued orders prohibiting any but parish priests to administer communion in his diocese. This ordinance was directed against the Jesuits who, it was reported, had been spoken of as heretics by the Archbishop.³

Salamanca was the centre of the most violent storm of opposition to the new Order. Cardinal Francisco de Mendoza, Bishop of Coria, had in Rome proposed to the General that he should erect a Jesuit college in that city of Spain in which the first university had been opened. This had taken place in Salamanca in 1548. In the learned and wealthy Doctor Alonzo Ramirez de Vergara the school had a liberal benefactor.⁴ There an antagonist of the new community arose in the person of the

¹ ORLANDINUS, l. 14, n. 9; Dictamina S. Ignatii (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., I., 478).

² Francesco de Rojas, S.J., to Araoz, dat. Saragossa, Aug. 1548 (Epist. Mixtae, I., 555-557); ASTRAIN, I., 441-452.

³ Francesco de Villanueva, S.J., to Ignatius, dat. Guadalajara, Oct. 31, 1549 (Epist. Mixtae, II., 302).

⁴ Vergara wished to join the Society, but was prevented by external circumstances all his life long (POLANCUS, I., n. 463). This has recently been adduced erroneously as evidence that he was throughout his life a secret member, and has given rise to the curious identification of the class of "Indifferentes" (see *supra*, p. 62) with a class of "Secret Jesuits." No such class exists among the members of the Order. For the beginnings of the College at Salamanca, see ASTRAIN, I., 298-303.

Dominican Melchior Cano, since 1546 first professor of theology in the University of Salamanca, and a man whose brilliant gifts and deep learning had made him the pride of Spain. The strange hallucination took possession of him that the Jesuits were the forerunners of Antichrist. He first gave public utterance to this notion during the Lenten sermons of the year 1548. At the close of the same year, on the 25th of November, the Jesuit Alvarez had to inform Ignatius: "To-day Doctor Cano preached before the whole University: one of the curses of Christendom is the short-sightedness of those prelates who, in order to please some pious souls, give their sanction to new and laxly regulated orders; I mean orders whose members go to and fro about the streets like other people—an order of loungers, I call them; they are given up to indolence, they take good care not to mortify the body, they procure for themselves permission to say their prayers out of the curtailed Roman breviary." Fourteen days later Cano was understood to say, "Signs shall go before the Last Judgment. Among them hypocrisies, 'Alumbrado'—revelations, exercises, and what now is deemed holy shall then be accursed and led down to hell."¹

Cano did not name the Jesuits, but everybody knew of whom he spoke. Fingers were pointed at them in Salamanca; to hold converse with them was to forfeit reputation. The persecuted teachers suffered quietly for a time and waited; they then sought out Cano and privately addressed to him explanations and arguments. When this was unavailing Ignatius bethought him of a more telling means of defence. At his instigation the General of the Order of Preachers, Francisco Romeo, sent from Rome in December 1548 a

¹ *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, II., 485-488; *Epist. Mixtae*, I., 491, 492; Ignatius to J. de Avila and to M. Torres, dat. Jan. 24 and 26, 1549 (*Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., II., 319, 320, 331); *ASTRAIN*, I., 321-333.

circular letter to all brothers of his Order in which he announced "that the Society of Jesus had the approval of the Pope, and was doing an extraordinary amount of good by its labours and example; he therefore, in virtue of holy obedience, forbade any attack, public or private, on the new Order, which ought rather to be looked upon as an ally in their spiritual warfare and to receive their protection and help."¹ Somewhat before this Pope Paul III., at the request of Cardinal Mendoza, had written already to the Bishops of Cuença and Salamanca in which he bitterly complained that evil men in Salamanca and in some other parts of Spain had blackened the Society and its members in sermons, lectures, and confidential conversation, thereby depriving them of popular confidence and undermining their influence for good; the Pope therefore appointed the two bishops protectors of the Order and gave them all the necessary powers.² Cano now held his peace for some time.

The feeling of enmity towards the Jesuits began to wane in Salamanca. To this change of disposition contributed especially, together with Estrada's Lent sermons and the devotion of his comrade Miguel Torres to those in prison and under sentence of death, the Apologia of the Jesuits, written by a member of Cano's own Order, the distinguished Dominican Juan de Peña. Louis of Granada also, great as a master of Spanish style, greater still as a master of the Christian life, one of the noblest ornaments of the Dominican Order in that century, was a staunch and outspoken friend of the Society. For some time indeed it seemed as if another great spiritual teacher, Thomas of Villanova, Archbishop of Valencia, were about to take his place among the opponents of the Jesuits; to him, the stern Augustinian monk, many things in the new Order

¹ Printed in the *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, II., 492-494.

² Published in the *Cartas de S. Ignacio*, II., 480-484.

seemed dangerous and suspicious, but when the saintly man was shown how all had been approved at Rome, he disquieted himself no longer and became a great benefactor of the Order.¹ John of Avila, the Apostle of Andalusia, deplored that old age and illness hindered him from joining the Society; but, he wrote to Ignatius, he wished to do all that he could for them; from the first he had seen in them a work of God and a gift of Providence.²

Much closer to the Society was yet another saint to be drawn. When Ignatius in 1527 was brought prisoner to Alcalà on a charge of heresy, he was met in the street, so the story goes, by the young Marquis Francisco de Lombay, eldest son of Duke Juan III. of Gandia,³ mounted high on his steed, with a retinue of friends and servants. Little did either of the two men dream in what altered circumstances they should meet together in the years to come.

Appointed viceroy of Catalonia by Charles V. in 1539, Francis Borgia, who was in 1542 a Tertiary of the Franciscan Order, heard through Peter Faber of the Society of Jesus. Soon afterwards his father Juan III. died, and Francis succeeded to the Dukedom of Gandia. One of the responsibilities he now felt most strongly was the care for the newly converted Moors; in order to give them religious help he founded at Lombay a large Dominican convent. For the education of the young Moriscos he wished to found a school in the town of Gandia and hand it over to the Jesuits; Ignatius, however, urged him to found a special

¹ Epist. Mixtae, I., 256-258; ASTRAIN, I., 333-339, 657-669.

² Ignatius to Avila, dat. Rome, Jan. 24, 1549, and Polanco to Villanueva, dat. Rome, Jan. 25, 1549 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., II., 317, 325); POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 465.

³ BARTOLI, Ignazio, I. I., n. 33; P. SUAUV, St. François de Borgia, Paris, 1905, 11.

college. While hitherto these institutions had been reserved for young members of the Order only, now for the first time admission would be given to Moorish children as well and to others from outside. The college was opened in 1546, and Paul III. raised it in the following year to the rank of a university. The Duchess did not live to see this, for she died on the 27th of March 1546. Thereupon Francis went through the Exercises and took a vow to enter the Order.¹ He could not, however, refuse to take his place by the side of Philip on the assembling of the Estates of Aragon in 1547. The Prince wished also to make him his "Major-domo"; but Borgia now resolved to withdraw gradually from the world. Ignatius obtained for him the Papal permission to take the vows of solemn profession and notwithstanding this to administer during three years his temporal possessions; by that time his children would be provided for and his foundations completed.²

On the 1st of February 1548 Francis made profession at Gandia before a few witnesses; the documents were put on paper in secret characters and sent to Rome.³ Borgia continued to dress as a layman and to keep princely state. The step that he had taken was not publicly known in Spain until 1551.⁴ Six months after his profession the General had to shorten by half Francis' periods of prayer and to prohibit his macerating scourgings and fastings; "otherwise," wrote Ignatius, "his bodily strength will be ruined"; there must be "*mens sana in corpore*

¹ POLANCUS, I., n. 107; Sanctus Franciscus Borgia, II., Matri, 1903, xx-xxi, 504, 532, 535; SUAUI, 64-66, 80-83; ASTRAIN, I., 275, 284, 285, 287, 303, 304.

² POLANCUS, I., n. 211, 274; PETRUS RIBADENEIRA, S.J., Vita Francisci Borgiae, P. Andrea Schotto interprete, c. 3, n. 52 (Acta Sanctorum, Octob., V., 246).

³ Printed in Sanctus Franciscus Borgia, II., 545.

⁴ POLANCUS, I., n. 276.

sano.”¹ Now already, while yet amid the preliminaries to his ordination as priest, Francis was setting forth “the greater glory of God” by his exemplary virtue, his wisdom, his influence over the wielders of spiritual and temporal power. Since his Duchy was the exclusive heritage of his eldest son and his remaining seven children had not means adequate to their position, Paul III. sanctioned, at his petition, on the 23rd of January 1549, his appropriation, as a provision for the latter, of 25,000 ducats from the residuary estate of his great-uncle, Giovanni, Duke of Camerino and Nepi, who had died intestate.²

On their way to India the members of the Society touched the soil of Portugal. The Portuguese doctor Diego de Gouvea wrote from Paris to his former pupil Ignatius to ask whether he and his associates did not wish to evangelize the Portuguese Indies. Ignatius sent him the reply that “they were ready to go joyfully to the Indies when the Pope sent them.” On this King John III. applied to Paul III. for six Jesuit missionaries for the East Indies. Ignatius, however, could only spare two, Francis Xavier and Simon Rodriguez. In Lisbon they had to await a passage, but there they so captivated the people by their apostolic fervour that they were implored to abandon their journey; finally, with the Pope’s consent, Rodriguez at last resolved to remain in Portugal.³ The

¹ Ignatius to Borgia, dat. Rome, Sept. 20, 1548 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., ii, 233-237).

² The brief is in Sanctus Franciscus Borgia, I., 655-660; for the date, *cf.* SUAU in the Etudes, CII. (1905), 186. The arrangements for raising a monument to Alexander were altered by Pius IV., and finally the scheme appears to have been altogether abandoned (*cf.* SUAU, *loc. cit.*).

³ Peter Faber to Gouvea, dat. Rome, Nov. 23, 1538 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., i, 132-134); RIBADENEIRA, De actis etc., n. 88, 89; Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., i, 380-383; Vita Ignatii, l. 2, c. 16; l. 3, c. 3.

King entrusted the Society with the spiritual direction of the young noblemen who, to the number of nearly a hundred, were brought up at court. Almost all, Ignatius reported in 1542, go to confession and communion weekly and hear sermons every Friday.¹ Many young men sought admission to the Order, and the King sent them to study at his University of Coimbra; the college which he established there for the Society numbered in 1547 already 115 members of the Order, including 92 scholastics; John spent yearly 3000 ducats on their upkeep. In 1545 Ignatius had to yield to the King's pressing request that Rodriguez should undertake the tuition of his son. In the following year Rodriguez was also nominated Provincial of Portugal. For the college of Coimbra in the years 1545-46 he composed, on a basis given him by Ignatius in Italy, a series of general rules and some also for special employments, which later were widely adopted throughout the whole Order. The Blessed Peter Faber praised the piety and discipline which he maintained among the Portuguese brethren.² They were popularly called "the Apostles." When they passed through the country in their poverty, preaching and administering the Sacraments, every town and every village was open to them.³

In 1548 the Jesuits Gonsalvez and Nuñez passed over from Portugal to Morocco and conveyed to from 500 to 600 Christian captives in the Moorish city of Tetuan the

¹ Report to the Jesuits in Italy, dat. Rome, June 1, 1542 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., i, 204); *cf.* also ORLANDINUS, l. 2, n. 103, 105.

² POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 98, 99, 214; ORLANDINUS, l. 5, n. 57; l. 6, n. 98. The rules were first given to the public in the Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 822-873; *cf. ibid.*, 539, and Cartas del b. P. Fabro, I., 246, 247.

³ Johannes of Aragon, S.J., to Martin Santacruz, S.J., dat. Lisbon, June 5, 1548 (Epistolae Mixtae, I., 514, 515).

consolations of religion. Deeply touched by their afflictions, they returned to Portugal and collected clothes and medicines and money to the amount of over a thousand ducats. The King also committed to the Society the task of delivering captives.¹

It was at the instance of Paul III. that the first Jesuits went to Ireland. His choice fell on Alfonso Salmeron and Pascal Broët; they brought with them three Papal letters: one contained many ecclesiastical faculties; the second recommended them to the Irish bishops; the third concerned their free passage through the country.² The bearers were to visit in the Pope's name the Irish bishops and native princes, confirming them in their loyalty to the Church, exhorting the clergy, reforming convents, urging the erection of schools for Latin, pawnshops and similar beneficent institutions, and finding out suitable occupants for vacant Church offices. Ignatius specially urged upon them to adapt themselves as much as possible to Irish customs and "become all things to all men"; if they had to collect fines or burdens they were at once to distribute the money through others among the poor or see that it was spent on religious objects.³

Salmeron and Broët reached Scotland under great difficulties. There Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow, and other leading men strongly dissuaded them from pursuing their journey. They would accomplish nothing, they were told, and in view of the hostility of Henry VIII. to Rome were imperilling their lives. Nevertheless, they determined to go on, and James V. of Scotland, the father of Mary Stuart,

¹ POLANCUS, I., n. 289, 290; Peter Doménech to Araoz, dat. Almeria, March 1, 1549 (Epistolae Mixtae, II., 91).

² The letters are given in Epist. P. Pasch. Broëti, 204-214; cf. A. BELLESHEIM, Ireland, II., 80, 81.

³ See Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., i, 174-181, 727-731.

gave them letters to the Irish grandees and a companion for their journey. They landed on the island in the Lent of 1542; the Irish chiefs were entirely under the yoke of Henry VIII., and they had pledged themselves to a man to recognize the King as their ecclesiastical head and to deliver up the emissaries of the Pope. Loyal bishops had to go into concealment; the convents were for the most part deserted, the people savage and split into factions: "Not one stone has been left upon another," wrote Salmeron. They heard a few confessions, bestowed indulgences and other graces, but the English were on their track and they had no place of refuge to receive them. Thus after a sojourn of thirty-four days they returned, in accordance with their instructions, by way of Scotland to Italy.¹ "To outward appearance a failure," says one versed in Irish Church history,² "this first mission of the Jesuits to Ireland was destined in course of time to bear much fruit."

In France also the beginnings of the Order were not noticeable. Some young men were sent by Ignatius to Paris to study in 1540, and from time to time others joined them. In 1548 a group of eighteen students lived together in an annexe of the Lombards' college; they had their Superior and observed the rules of the Order, yet only a few knew that they belonged to the Society of Jesus;

¹ Salmeron to Ignatius, dat. Edinburgh, Feb. 2 and April 9, 1542; Salmeron and Broët to Cardinal Cervini, dat. Edinburgh, April 9, 1542 (Epistolae P. A. Salmeronis, I., 2-9, 11-13; Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti, 23-31); EDM. HOGAN, *Ibernia Ignatiana*, I., Dublinii, 1880, 2-7.

² BELLESHEIM, *Ireland*, II., 82. Even R. W. DIXON (*History of the Church of England from the abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction*, III., London, 1902, 421), writing from the Anglican point of view, admits that this mission, "though unsuccessful," was yet "not without fruit."

the majority were lads who dressed as laymen in clothes of different cut and colour.¹

When in 1542, on account of the war between Francis I. and the Emperor, proclamation was made to the University of Paris that all subjects of Charles V. must quit France under pain of death and confiscation of property, eight members of the Jesuit colony in Paris migrated to Louvain. Here two of the most prominent citizens went through the Spiritual Exercises: the Inquisitor Dietrich von Heeze, once the confidential minister of Adrian VI., and the learned theologian Ruard Tapper, Chancellor of Louvain University. Heeze was ready to enter the Society, but Peter Faber, to whom he had made known his resolve, dissuaded him on account of his age and the great influence for good he was able to wield outside the Order. The first recruit from Louvain was Cornelius Vischhaven,² a priest of great piety and strictness of life. Peter Faber during a short stay in Louvain had so ingratiated himself and his cause in the hearts of the youth of the University that, on the rumour of his departure for Portugal, nineteen undergraduates declared their wish to accompany him; nine of them he sent thither.³ In 1547 the members of the Order in Louvain chose Vischhaven as their Superior and drew up regulations for the ordering of their common life. Ignatius confirmed the latter, but enjoined on the community that the permission of

¹ Viola, S.J., to Polcano, dat. Paris, July 19, 1549 (*Epistolae Mixtae*, II., 257); POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 439; OLIV. MANAREUS, *Commentarius*, 63, 64; ORLANDINUS, I. 9, n. 56.

² POLANCUS, I., n. 42, 55.

³ Cf. Faber to F. Xavier, dat. Cologne, Jan. 24, 1544 (*Cartas del b. P. Fabro*, I., 209-216); ORLANDINUS, I. 4, n. 37-40, 82; W. VAN NIEUWENHOFF, *Leven van den H. Ignatius van Loyola*, II., Amsterdam, 1892, 50-52.

the Bishop of Liège should be invited for their corporate settlement.¹

As in the Netherlands, so in Germany the first appearance of the Jesuits was, so to speak, the result of accident. Peter Faber had been instructed by Paul III. to accompany the Imperial ambassador Ortiz into Spain. Then Ortiz received orders to attend the conference on religion at Worms: he took Faber with him, and both reached their destination in 1540. Faber occupied himself with the confessional and the Exercises;² afterwards he went with Ortiz to Ratisbon, whither the conference had been transferred and a Diet summoned. Here so many applied for the Exercises that Faber's time was insufficient; some who had gone through them undertook to give them to others; thus Cochlæus initiated the Bishop of Meissen and Robert Wauchope the Bishop of Spire; Faber himself took charge of the Prince Abbot of Kempton and the Portuguese envoy. Ecclesiastical and secular princes became penitents of Faber, among them the Duke of Savoy. In a letter from Ratisbon of June the 8th, 1541, the Pope was informed: "No small benefit, as we know from experience, has accrued from the Exercises both among the princes and their subjects. Some were faltering, now they are strengthened; some had already fallen away, now they are restored."³

From Ratisbon in the summer of 1541 Faber had to go with Ortiz into Spain. But he was soon to be back again

¹ VINCK, S.J., to the Cologne Jesuits, dat. Maestricht, March 31, 1547; Crusius and Ignatius to the Louvain Jesuits, dat. March 1 and May 24, 1547, in HANSEN, 72, 76, 77, 87, 88; cf. *L'établissement de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les Pays-Bas*, Bruxelles, 1886, 8.

² Faber to Ignatius, dat. Worms, Dec. 27, 1540, and Jan. 1, 1541 (*Cartas del b. P. Fabro*, 31, 32, 38, 39); ORLANDINUS, l. 2, n. 107.

³ RAYNALDUS, 1541, n. 125.

in Germany. Paul III., on the strength of reports received from the citizens of Ratisbon, summoned Faber with Le Jay and Bobadilla to Germany in 1542. Faber reached Spires on the 17th of April and awaited the instructions of the Papal nuncio Morone; the Rhenish district was assigned to him as his sphere of work. In Spires itself he gave the Exercises to the Cathedral cantor, Otto Truchsess von Waldburg, who afterwards as Cardinal and Bishop of Augsburg was one of the chief pillars of the Church in Germany.¹ Morone then ordered him to go to Mayence. The Archbishop and Cardinal, Albert of Brandenburg, wished to make full use of his services for the restoration of the spiritual and moral condition of his clergy, fallen into deep decay. In Mayence also he was chosen as master of the Exercises by two of the best bishops in Germany: one was the gentle, high-minded Julius Pflug, Bishop of Naumberg, and the other the learned and eloquent Michael Helling, then Bishop-coadjutor of Mayence, later Bishop of Merseburg. Faber lived with the parish priest of St. Christopher and turned him, as Canisius expressed it, from a "concupinarius into a Carthusian." At the Cardinal's wish he began, in the winter of 1542, a course of lectures on the Psalms. Albert also had a plan of appointing him, with other theologians, to attend the Council of Trent.²

In the following summer Faber, with the Archbishop's consent, complied with repeated and pressing invitations to visit Cologne. The Archbishop, Hermann von Wied,

¹ Cartas del b. P. Fabro, 73-100, 139-153; Memoriale Fabri, 17-21; DUHR, *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, 7 *seq.*

² Faber to Ignatius, dat. Mayence, Nov. 7 and Dec. 22, 1542 (Cartas del b. P. Fabro, 163-166); Canisius to Busäus, dat. Freiburg i. d. Schw., Jan. 2, 1596, in HANSEN, 10 *seq.*; *cf.* also FRID. REIFFENBERGIUS, S.J., *Historia Societatis Jesu ad Rhenum inferiorem, Coloniae Agripp.*, 1764, 3-12.

an ignorant man and of totally mundane character, had summoned the apostate Dominican, Martin Bucer, in 1542 to protestantize the archiepiscopal foundations of Cologne. A substantial portion of the Cathedral chapter, the secular Estates, and some of the Council of the Imperial city of Cologne were on his side; the Catholics held back through fear of the Archbishop. Faber now bestirred himself and went to Bonn, where the Emperor and Hermann had a meeting in order to present to the Papal nuncio a memorial from the University of Cologne setting forth the necessity of some serious intervention. The representations addressed by the Emperor to the lax ruler of the archdiocese were productive of at least some good results; soon afterwards a petition from Cologne reached the nuncio in which he was implored not to allow Faber to depart from the city. This was followed by a Papal command which provisionally detained Faber in Germany.¹ Faber, whose sermons in Cologne were a great success,² hired a house there and made it a home for the seven young Jesuits who, in the meantime, had gathered in the city. He was thus the founder of the first Jesuit settlement in German territory.³

In July 1544 Ignatius called him back to Portugal, and two years later he died in Rome; the Church venerates him as Blessed. In his spiritual diary Faber noted on the 10th of June 1543: Since he had come to know Germany the thought of such a people falling away from the Church

¹ DUHR, 9-14. Canisius in his censure (made *c.* 1572) of Ribadeneira's Life of Ignatius affirmed that Faber also "on certain occasions had disputed with Bucer and other heretics" (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., i, 716).

² Cartas del b. P. Fabro, I., 235, 236; R. CORNELY, Life of Blessed Peter Faber, Freiburg i. Br., 1900, 130-154.

³ Memoriale 327; DUHR, 13, 14.

filled his soul with continual anguish. This sacred compassion was never extinguished; among the seven persons for whom he specially prayed were, besides the Pope and Emperor, also Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer, and among the seven cities for which he had all his life long undertaken to intercede Wittenberg held the first place.¹

The lovable and popular qualities which adorned Faber were also conspicuous in his companion Claude Le Jay; he also looked for salvation much more in a reformation of morals than in the contests of theologians.² The nuncio Morone in 1542 sent him to work about the Danube and in Bavaria. "I have hopes that his work will be of service," wrote Morone to Cardinal Contarini.³ Le Jay came with Wauchope to Ratisbon, where they presented the Papal letters to the Bishop and Chapter;⁴ they could not, however, obtain a footing. In the city Le Jay incurred odium because he urged the removal of a preacher of bad repute; many of the clergy too were unwilling to change their mode of life, and the two strangers were threatened with expulsion from the city or immersion in the Danube. "We told them," said Le Jay, "that heaven can be reached by water as easily as by dry land."⁵ But at the beginning of 1543 Le Jay had to leave Ratisbon; he went to Ingolstadt and gave lectures at the University on the Holy Scriptures; he was called upon to introduce Moritz von Hutten, Bishop of Eichstätt, then living in his neighbour-

¹ *Memoriale* 22, 29, 30, 299; *cf.* also PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 233, 306.

² RODERICIUS, *Commentarium*, 453; JANSSEN-PASTOR, IV., 16th ed., 397-400.

³ HANSEN, 2. For Le Jay, see DUHR, 15-24.

⁴ Wauchope to Farnese, dat. Ratisbon, April 13, 1542 (*Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, XXI., 603).

⁵ Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Ratisbon, April to August 1542 (*Epistolae P. Pasch.*, Broëti, 270-276).

hood, to the Spiritual Exercises ; then, in obedience to the Pope's commands, he went to Dillingen to Cardinal Truchsess.¹ Here he was met by an invitation from Duke Ernest of Bavaria, Archbishop of Salzburg, to attend a Provincial Synod, at which he should sit as a member and vote. But he was aware that it would be contrary to the Pope's wishes to take part in deliberations on religious questions at the approaching Diet at Worms, and he was under the impression that this assembly at Salzburg would prepare the way directly for such deliberations ; he therefore confined himself to receiving the resolutions in his chamber and expressing his opinion upon them. At Salzburg he also composed two theses : one maintaining the Bishop's responsibility for prohibiting, without special permission from the Pope, participation in the ecclesiastical debates in an Imperial Diet ; the other, proving that Protestants were still heterodox if, even while holding another doctrine of the Faith, they denied solely and exclusively the primacy of the Pope of Rome. At the same time he made use of the opportunity of urging on the Archbishop the need of establishing a boarding-house for boys who were to be trained for the priesthood.² On his return to Dillingen the Cardinal had already set out for Worms ; Le Jay had to follow him. His sermons in Italian, delivered during the Diet, pleased King Ferdinand and others in high station ; the bishops often invited him to their tables and asked him to visit their sees.³

¹ POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 72 ; ORLANDINUS, l. 4, n. 22-25.

² Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Dillingen, Nov. 14, 1544 ; Doménech to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, Jan. 29, 1545 (*Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti*, 281-285, 775, 776) ; POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 72.

³ Le Jay to Ignatius, dat. Dillingen, Sept. 21, 1545 (*Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti*, 293-296) ; Canisius to Peter Faber, dat. Cologne, Aug. 12, 1545 (*BRAUNSBERGER*, I., 159).

Other tasks were allotted to Nicolas Bobadilla, Le Jay's colleague from the Order. Morone was of opinion that he should accompany the Imperial forces into Hungary, there to put a curb on the Lutheran preachers, attend to the spiritual interests of the soldiery, and exercise an improving influence on the clergy.¹ He was kept, however, in Vienna; the nuncio Girolamo Verallo wished to have him in his house, but Bobadilla preferred to lodge in a hospital; he preached, gave expositions of the Epistle to the Romans, and prepared Jews and Turks for baptism; King Ferdinand often had conversations with him. But soon afterwards began for Bobadilla a period of constant shifting to and fro with the most varied activity. With Verallo, whose nunciature to the Emperor was soon changed for that to the King, he visited Nuremberg, Spiers, Worms, Brussels, and Ratisbon. In the intervals he was engaged in writing, preached in Latin at Passau and Ratisbon, visited, at the bidding of Cardinal Farnese, the Imperial camp during the Schmalkaldic war and took care of the Italian hospital, engaged in the reconstruction of the University curriculum at Cologne, and supported the Catholics of that city in their contest with the apostate Archbishop.² In the address of a letter from the Bishop of Vienna, Frederick Nausea, to Bobadilla, the latter was termed "the most vigilant agent of the Apostolic See in all Germany."³

Bobadilla was always ready to speak and had much

¹ Morone to Cardinal Contarini, dat. Modena, May 21, 1542 (HANSEN, 1-2).

² POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 40; Ferron by order of Ignatius to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, April 12, 1546 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., i, 377); DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 20 *seq.*; DUHR, 25-31; GIUS. BOERO, S.J., Vita del Servo di Dio. P. Nicolò Bobadiglia, Firenze, 1879, 22-50.

³ Epistolae Mixtae, I., 365-368.

to say, sometimes with a touch of braggadocio. He spoke his mind to ecclesiastical and temporal magnates alike, with a frankness which more than once was disfigured by bluntness and discourtesy; it was on account of this that his German career came to an abrupt end. The asperity of his language with regard to the Interim led the Emperor to dismiss him from Augsburg;¹ he went to Rome, where Ignatius gave him a cold reception.² Canisius some years later gave him testimony: that he had worked hard for the Germans in war and peace, run great dangers, and "put a sturdy shoulder to the wheel" on behalf of the Catholic cause, especially at Diets of the Empire.³

Bobadilla and his two comrades had worked on German soil as strangers; the first German Jesuit and at the same time the greatest among them was Peter Canisius. Born in Nymegen in 1521 of a family of good standing, he studied at Cologne as a youth, taking his degree of doctor in philosophy in 1540.⁴ Three years later he was led through the Spiritual Exercises by Peter Faber; there, as he himself tells us, he heard the voice of God calling him to join the Order. He took the vows on the 8th of May 1543.⁵ Returning to Cologne from Mayence, he pursued his

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 327, n. 1.

² Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., i, 467.

³ Censure on Ribadeneira's Life of Ignatius (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., i, 715).

⁴ Canisii Liber primus Confessionum (composed in 1570), c. 1-4; Canisii Testamentum (his spiritual testament, composed at Freiburg i. d. Schw. about 1596, shortly before his death), c. 12; (BRAUNSBERGER, I., 7-21, 34-40).

⁵ "One of the most important gains which ever accrued to the Society," says FRIEDENSBURG (Die ersten Jesuiten in Deutschland, Halle, 1905, 34). His "acquisition," remarks E. Zirngiebl, "was productive of a rich harvest to the Order in Germany" (Studien über das Institut der Gesellschaft Jesu, Leipzig, 1870, 262).

theological studies ; in addition he began at once to lecture on academic subjects, gave Latin addresses to students and ecclesiastics, and preached simple sermons to the people ; he was also anxious to promote frequent communion, especially among young students.¹ He was the first member of the Order to appear publicly as an author ; in 1543 he published at Cologne an enlarged and improved edition of the writings of the mystic John Tauler the Dominican ; in 1546 this was followed by a Latin translation in three folio volumes of the works of Cyril of Alexandria and of Leo the Great.² The small band of Jesuits, consisting almost entirely of students, which had been formed at Cologne in 1544, was supported for the most part on the paternal inheritance of Canisius.³ The part taken by him in the struggle with Archbishop Hermann von Wied was an active one. He went, at the bidding of the clergy and University of Cologne, in quest of help and protection to the Emperor and the Papal nuncio in the Netherlands, then to Bishop George of Austria in Liège, and again to the Emperor and nuncio in Suabia.⁴ From this last mission he was unable to return to Cologne, for Cardinal Otto von Truchsess of Augsburg sent him to the Council of Trent.⁵ Then, in obedience to the General of

¹ Canisius to Adriano Adriani, dat. Cologne, Aug. 2, 1546 (BRAUNSBERGER, I., 208, 209) ; Testamentum, c. 2 (*ibid.*, 38 ; *cf. ibid.*, 112, 124, 143, 160).

² BRAUNSBERGER, I., 79-93, 176-188, 215-222 ; SOMERVOGEL, Bibliothèque, II., 617, 618 ; VIII., 1974.

³ HANSEN, II, 23-27 ; SACHINUS, De Vita P. Canisii, Ingolstadii, 1616, 32.

⁴ Canisius to Faber, dat. Cologne, Aug. 12 and Dec. 22, 1545, and to Johannes Gropper, dat. Geislingen, Jan. 24, 1547, and Ulm, Jan. 28, 1547 (BRAUNSBERGER, I., 162-165, 233-240 ; *cf. ibid.*, 674-676) ; MATTH. RADERUS, S.J., De Vita Petri Canisii, Monachii, 1614, 36, 37.

⁵ See *supra*, p. 80.

the Order, he went to Bologna, Rome, and Messina; his continuance in Italy, however, was not to be for long; he belonged to Germany.

After the death of Johann Eck the reputation of the University of Ingolstadt began to decline. In order to infuse new life into the institution the firm Catholic Duke William IV. of Bavaria sought permission from Paul III. to levy three-tenths on every convent and benefice in his dominions for this purpose.¹ At the same time he asked the Pope to send him some Jesuits as professors of theology; among them was to be Le Jay. The Duke found every encouragement in Rome, for Paul III. and those in his confidence were anxiously desirous of establishing Jesuit colleges in Germany.² At the Pope's bidding Ignatius appointed Le Jay, Salmeron, and Canisius for Ingolstadt;³ Canisius was first sent for from Messina to Rome. On the 2nd of September 1549 he and his colleagues received the Papal blessing. On the way to Germany the three future professors of theology submitted themselves in the University of Bologna to an examination by Bishop Ambrogio Catarino and two other Dominicans, and then received from the Papal Legate, Cardinal Giovanni Maria del Monte, the cap of doctor of theology.⁴

Meeting as they advanced with friendly receptions from the Cardinals of Trent and Augsburg and from the Duke of Bavaria, they reached Ingolstadt on the 13th of November 1549. The University prepared for them a

¹ The brief of Paul III. is given by JOS. NEP. MEDERER: *Annales Ingolstadiensis Academiae*, IV., Ingolstadii, 1782, 271-275.

² Ignatius to Salmeron, dat. Rome, Aug. 10, 1549 (*Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., ii, 509).

³ POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I., n. 428; *cf.* *Mon. Ignat.*, Ser. I., ii, 360, 361, 378; BRAUNSBERGER, I., 296, 686-688; DUHR, 53.

⁴ POLANCUS, I., n. 548; BRAUNSBERGER, I., 685, 686.

public reception, and on November the 26th Canisius opened his course of lectures.¹ It was one of the last successes within reach of Paul III. that he was able to send Peter Canisius to the field of work for which he was the right man. The time had now come when a summons to halt was to be given to the victorious onrush of Protestantism, since of its previous conquests a portion were to be re-won. Canisius was one of the best leaders in these successful contests; during their continuance under the successors of Paul III. he won for himself the name of a second Apostle of Germany and elevation to the altars of the Church by his academic exertions, his countless sermons and instructions, his composition of catechisms and many other writings, the accomplishment of arduous tasks laid upon him by the Pope, indefatigable work at the diets and other assemblies, the foundation and direction of colleges of his Order, and finally by his life of prayer and genuine holiness.²

Before the call to Bavaria had come the Jesuits had received an invitation to cross over into Africa. The occasion was in some ways a remarkable one. King John III. of Portugal received one day a letter from Claudius Atanaf Sagad, the Negus of Abyssinia. The latter wrote: Some years before a man had appeared before him who stated that he had been recognized by the Pope of Rome as Patriarch of Æthiopia, but personally

¹ BRAUNSBERGER, I., 689-691; POLANCUS, I., n. 432-434; FLOR. RIESS, S.J., *Der selige Petrus Canisius*, Freiburg i. Br., 1865, 81-86; *cf.* also IGN. AGRICOLA, S.J., *Historia Provinciae Societatis Jesu Germaniae Superioris*, I., Augustae Vindelicorum, 1727, 19, 20.

² For judgments of Catholics and non-Catholics on Canisius, see BRAUNSBERGER, I., xviii-xxiii. See also the exhaustive work of X. LE BACHELET: *Canisius* (*Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, II., Paris, 1905, 1507-1537).

he evinced himself to be unfitted for such a post. The Negus wished to be informed if this man were really Patriarch, and if not, asked the King to send him one with due authority, for the Abyssinians wished to obey the Pope.¹ King John could think of nothing better than to turn to Ignatius for help. His wish was, he wrote, that one of the Jesuits should undertake the Patriarchate.² This was a case in which there was sore need of help. The cleric Juan Bermudez, who had joined himself in 1541 to a troop of Portuguese on their journey to Abyssinia, had certainly played the part, in that country, of Catholic Patriarch, but he had received from Rome neither consecration nor jurisdiction; he was an interloper, not to say an impostor.³ Ignatius did not reject the petition, since it did not concern the acceptance of a dignity bringing with it pomp and leisure but of heavy and difficult burden.⁴ The transaction was not finally settled until 1555, when the Portuguese Jesuit, Nuñez Barreto, was consecrated to the office.

The Order was more speedily settled on the Congo. The mission of the Jesuits was already begun here in 1548, but unfortunately the promise of its inception was not fulfilled. Loyola's disciples were happier in their Brazilian mission of 1549, when they successfully laid the foundations of the conversion of the South American Indians.⁵

¹ Rodriguez, S.J., to Ignatius, dat. Almeirim, March 18, 1546 (Epistolae P. Pasch. Broëti, 543, 544).

² John III. to Ignatius, dat. Santarem, Aug. 1546; Ignatius to Rodriguez, dat. Rome, Oct. 1546, and to Torres, dat. Rome, Oct. 9, 1546 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., i, 428-430, 434).

³ Cf. C. BECCARI, S.J., *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores occidentales inediti*, V., Romae, 1907, liii-lx. See also reports of Gött. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. Phil.-histor. Kl. (1904), 70 *seqq.*

⁴ Cf. Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., i, 430.

⁵ See *infra*, 516 *seqq.*

All these undertakings were as nothing compared with the results to which the Order could already point in the newly discovered regions of Asia, where history is linked with the fame of a man whose name is still revered to this day by friend and foe alike: with that of Francis Xavier.¹ On the 16th of March 1540 Xavier left Rome to go at the Pope's orders to the East Indies. On May the 30th he reached Lisbon, where he received four briefs: the first, dated July the 27th, 1540, appointed him Papal nuncio for the Portuguese Indies on both sides of the Ganges, and of the Cape of Good Hope, with full ecclesiastical powers; two other briefs enlarged his powers, and in a fourth he was recommended to the Princes and rulers of these territories.² While Francis was waiting for a passage at Lisbon high and low showered marks of respect upon him: he consoled himself for the absence of tribulation by the thought of the sacrifices he should be able to offer in India; to be long without suffering, he thought, was to be no true soldier of Christ.³ Suffering awaited him on the voyage, which lasted more than a year.

On the 6th of May 1542 he landed in Goa. At once, as one of his biographers⁴ relates, he threw himself at the feet of the Bishop of the country, the Franciscan Juan de Albuquerque, showed him his faculties, and declared that he wished to use them simply at the bidding

¹ *Cf. supra*, p. 22.

² Text of first brief and main substance of the rest in L. J. M. CROS, S.J.: *St. François de Xavier, Sa vie et ses lettres*, I., Toulouse, Paris, 1900, 484-486.

³ POLANCUS, n. 23.

⁴ P. Sebastian Gonsalvez, S.J., who went to the East Indies in 1593 and died at Goa in 1619. He composed a history of the Society while in India which is still unpublished (*Mon. Xaver.*, I., xxiv-xxv); his account of Xavier's first stay in Goa is in CROS, I., 214, 217.

of the Bishop. He looked upon himself only as the fellow-worker of the Franciscans, Augustinians, and other apostolic men whose labours lay in this difficult region. The Christian population of Goa was morally in a bad condition. Xavier quickly made up his mind; he made his dwelling in a hospital and began a fight in good earnest against the immorality of the Portuguese colonial officials;¹ he collected alms from house to house for the sick, the poor, the prisoners; ringing a little bell as he went, he called to the children and male and female slaves in the streets to come and listen to Christian teaching; he also taught them to sing songs in which truths of the Catholic faith were conveyed in verse.² Already on the 20th of September 1542 he was able to inform his brethren at Rome that so many had come to confession that in order to satisfy all he would need to multiply himself by ten; he had also induced the prisoners to make general confessions; the lepers outside the city had all become his good friends, and the viceroy was now sending him to a quarter where he had hopes of many conversions.³ This was the so-called Fisherman's Coast or Cape Comorin. Eight years before the baptism of several heathens had taken place, but as the place was barren and poverty-stricken, no Portuguese could settle there; the inhabitants were out of reach of all spiritual help. Xavier took with

¹ Cf. A. HUHNS in *Katholik*, 1899, II., 538 *seq.*

² GONSALVEZ, *loc. cit.*; cf. also HORATIUS TURELLINUS, S.J., *De Vita B. Francisci Xaverii, Coloniae Agripp.*, 1621, l. 2, c. 23 (112-120).

³ *Mon. Xaver.*, I., 256-258. The *Monumenta historiae Societatis Jesu* (cf. *supra*, p. 1, see n. 1) contain in the first volume of the *Monumenta Xaveriana* an edition of the letters of the saint. These were taken from the autograph copies in Spanish (cf. also CROS, II., xxi-xl; for earlier editions see SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque*, II., 1748; V., 882; VI., 1126; VIII., 140-143, 1326-1336; CROS, I., xvi-liv).

him three natives; afterwards he was joined by two of the Order. For a year he went from place to place leaving behind him written prayers which the inhabitants were to learn by heart and repeat daily.¹

The chief opponents of Christianity, the Brahmins, tried to bribe him, but he inexorably exposed their shams and had the idols destroyed. Many sick persons, for whom he prayed or had prayers said by the Christian children, were healed. Sometimes he gave baptism to a whole village; "Often," he wrote on the 15th of January 1544, "my arms are weary from baptizing and I cannot speak another word from having so repeatedly recited the prayers to the people, one after another, and given instructions in Christian duties to them in their native tongue." But, as he says in the same letter, he thereby feels an indescribable inner consolation. Only one thing caused him sorrow: "How many there are here who are not Christians because no man troubles himself about the pious and holy work of making known the faith!"²

Details of Xavier's work in India were brought to Portugal by young Juan Vaz, who for six months had been his companion in these countries. "I will send you," says Martin Santacruz to Peter Faber on the 22nd of October 1545, "some of the things Juan Vaz has told us": "Father Xavier goes about with bare feet; his garments are shabby and torn. He is called the 'great father' and all love him well. A king has given orders throughout his kingdom that all are to show obedience to his brother, the 'great father,' as though it were to himself; all who wish are free to become Christians. He also gave him much

¹ Francis Xavier to Ignatius, dat. Tutucorin, Oct. 28, 1542, and to the Roman Jesuits, dat. Cochin, Jan. 15, 1544 (Mon. Xaver., I., 273, 278-289); POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 47, 62, 64.

² Mon. Xaver., I., 283-286, 293.

money, but Xavier gave it all away among the poor. Along the coast he has built from forty-four to forty-five churches. He has four native-born Indians with him whom he has had ordained as priests. Six other Indians from the College of Goa are on the point of taking Orders. He takes with him two, three, four, yea six thousand men into the open country, mounts on a tree, and then preaches to them.”¹ In the following years Xavier made flying visits, preaching everywhere to Christians and heathens, to cities and districts on the frontier and in the interior of India; he carried his teaching to the island of Ceylon, and spent nearly a year in the Moluccas and the Isle of Amboina.²

All that was related of his ecstatic prayer, of his compassionate love for the children, the slaves, the sick, the sinners, the soldiers, of his prophecies, of his gifts of healing, of his raising of the dead,³ gave to his preaching an almost irresistible power. On the 27th of January 1545 he was able to write from Cochin to Rome that in the short space of a month he had baptized more than ten thousand men.⁴ He took special care to protect the newly made Christians from the greed of European adventurers and the violence of Portuguese officials. He called upon John III. in

¹ Epistolae Mixtae, I., 231, 232.

² See FR. CH. DANVERS, *The Portuguese India*, I., London, 1894, 481; P. COURTENAY, *Le Christianisme à Ceylon*, Lille-Rome, 1900, 156-166.

³ Testimony of Gaspar Coelho, then vicar of St. Thomas's Church at Meliapur (in CROS, I., 308-310); Gaspar Berse, S.J., to the Portuguese Jesuits, dat. Dec. 13, 1548 (*ibid.*, I., 395); Francis Perez to the Jesuits of Coimbra, about 1548 (*Selectae Indiarum Epistolae*, 67, 68); ORLANDINUS, l. 3, n. 99; l. 4, n. 64; l. 8, n. 127, 129; FRANC. DE SOUZA, S.J. (†1712), *Oriente conquistado á Jêsus Christo*, I., 2nd ed., Bombaim, 1881, 20-31.

⁴ Mon. Xaver., I., 366, 367.

strong and outspoken language to abolish such misdeeds.¹ What he had set on foot as a pioneer of the Gospel in different places is shown in the catechetical writings which he left behind him² and in the number of the members of the Order who, in ever-increasing numbers, were sent out to him from Europe. At the beginning of 1550, without speaking of Goa, the ground for colleges had been laid already in Bassein, Cochin, Quilon; other Jesuits were at work in the Moluccas, in Malacca, in the island of Socotra, on the coasts of Comorin.³ Xavier, named Provincial for India in 1549 by Ignatius, could give him witness that amid the dangers of the greatest moral corruption these men had led unsullied lives.⁴ The new viceroy of the Indies wrote to Portugal that the labours of the Jesuits resembled the labours of the Apostles of old.⁵ In the sensual mercantile city of Malacca in the year 1548 there were already many who frequented the Sacraments weekly—by 1550 the city was almost entirely transformed. On the fisher coast the Jesuit, Antonio Criminali, displayed special zeal; he fell there under the blows of savage assailants, the first victim of fidelity to pastoral duty.⁶

¹ To John III., dat. Cochin, Jan. 20, 1544; Jan. 20, 1548; Jan. 26, 1549; Malacca, June 20, 1549 (Mon. Xaver., I., 356-361, 450-455, 509-512, 527-530); *cf.* also ORLANDINUS, l. 4, n. 143, 153.

² *Cf.* SOMMERVOGEL, Bibliothèque, VIII., 1336. An exposition of the Confession of Faith, composed by Xavier in 1546 in the Moluccas, is in the Mon. Xaver., I., 831-844; other catechetical writings, *ibid.*, 819-831.

³ Xavier to Ignatius, dat. Cochin, Jan. 12, 1549 (Mon. Xaver., I. 476); Lancillotti to Ignatius, dat. Quilon, Jan. 27, 1550 (Selectae Indiarum Epistolae, 126, 127); Register of the missionaries in CROS, I., 481.

⁴ POLANCUS, n. 498; ORLANDINUS, l. 9, n. 1.

⁵ To Simon Rodriguez, dat. Cochin, Jan. 5, 1551 (Selectae Indiarum Epistolae, 130).

⁶ Perez to the Jesuits of Coimbra about 1548; Lancillotti to Ignatius, dat. Quilon, Jan. 27, 1550; Enrique Enriquez to Ignatius, dat. Punicale, Nov. 21, 1549; report of the Jesuit Cyprian on Criminali's

Xavier's steps were closely followed by the Netherlander, Gaspar Berse, who was sent in 1548 from the East Indies to the island of Ormuz. He lived in a thatched hut, gave daily instruction to children and slaves, preached three times a week, and disputed on Saturdays with the Jews in the synagogue. Thirty shocks of earthquake which visited the island on his arrival he made the occasion for penitential preaching. Every day he heard many confessions, feuds and illicit connections disappeared, all priests reformed themselves, and the Jesuit was looked up to by all, Christian and non-Christian, as a prophet and a worker of wonders.¹

From Cochin Francis Xavier wrote on the 20th of January 1548 to Ignatius and the other members of the Order in Rome: "When I was in the city of Malacca some Portuguese merchants informed me that a short time ago certain very large islands had been discovered in this part of the world, which are called the islands of Japan. There, so they affirmed, our holy faith might be spread with great success; there more than any other country of the Indies were great things to be hoped for, since the people of those islands were quick-witted and eager to learn."² In Malacca

death, dat. S. Thomé, Dec. 3, 1549 (*Selectae Indiarum Epistolae*, 70, 91, 92, 98-100, 127). Cf. [TACCHI VENTURI] *Nuove mem. e preziosi docum. intorme al P. A. Criminali, Protomartire d. Comp. di Gesù, Venezia, 1900.*

¹ Lancillotti to Ignatius, dat. Quilon, Jan. 27, 1550; *Nuove di M. Gaspar quali guinero a Goa a' 10 di Ottobre del 1549*; letter on the foundation of the College of Goa about 1550 (*Selectae Indiarum Epistolae*, 77-79, 120-122, 125-126; POLANCUS, *Chronicon*, I, n. 534-543; cf. also NIC. TRIGAULT, S.J., *Vita Gasparis Barzaei, Coloniae, 1611, 96-275*).

² *Mon. Xaver.*, I, 433-435. Japan was discovered by some Portuguese certainly about the year 1543 (*HANS HAAS, Gesch. des Christentums in Japan*, I, Tokio, 1902, 15-49).

also the Japanese, Angero,¹ came to Xavier, who converted him and determined to go with him to Japan. From Angero's accounts he had learned that in China, Japan, and Tartary the same religion, Buddhism, was professed, and his convert wished him to become acquainted with the "great schools" and to overcome them. From the universities Christian doctrine would penetrate among the people.² The Indian friends of Francis Xavier were beside themselves when they heard of his plans. They set before him the exceeding dangers of the journey; the sea was infested by pirates, and it was precisely Europeans, when they fell into their hands, on whom they were wont to perpetrate cruel tortures; besides, there were many hidden reefs and frightful storms, "when out of four ships two are saved, this is much"; Xavier was well aware of this, but he trusted in God, who has power over winds and robbers.³

Before his departure he wrote a letter to the General on his knees, as he himself tells us, asking his prayers for the undertaking.⁴ With two brothers of the Order and a few Japanese converts he left Malacca on the 24th of June 1549 for the island kingdom. As no other ship was to be found, he took the small junk of the Chinaman Necoda who, it would seem, was more of a pirate than a merchant.

¹ So Xavier calls him. In Japanese his name was probably Anjiro. Xavier himself was called by the Japanese historian Arai Hakuseki, "Frankusu Saberius" (HAAS, I., 27, 28, 57).

² Xavier to Rodriguez, dat. Cochin, Jan. 20, 1549 (Mon. Xaver., I., 487, 488).

³ Xavier to Ignatius, dat. Cochin, Jan. 12, 1549, and to Rodriguez, dat. Feb. 1, 1549 (Mon. Xaver, I., 477-479, 513).

⁴ Dat. Cochin, Jan. 12, 1549 (*ibid.*, 482).

⁵ ALEX. VALIGNANI, S.J., *Historia del principio y progreso de la Compañía de Jesús en las Indias Orientales*, I., 1, c. 16 (Mon. Xaver., I., 88, 89). Valignani († 1606), visitor of the Order in India and Japan,

They landed in Kagoshima, the home of Angero, on the 15th of August 1549. The latter converted his relations, and the Prince of Satsuma, to whom the city belonged, permitted all his vassals to become Christians. In November 1549 Francis Xavier addressed letters from Kagoshima in various directions in which he thus expressed himself: Among all the peoples who have recently been discovered, the Japanese seem to be the best; they have a high sense of honour, are valorous, seekers of knowledge; a great portion of the people can read and write; they listen willingly to speech concerning God; only the Bonzes are addicted to unnatural vices. Xavier wished to go to the Emperor at Miako, the modern Kioto, then the university of Japan; he was also thinking already of making his way, with the Emperor's help, into the Chinese Empire. He recommended to the leading teachers of the college at Goa the Chinese and Japanese youths who were studying there, begged the Jesuits of Malacca to show the greatest kindness to two Bonzes who were to land there, and called for three members of the Order to come to him in Japan.¹

The later work of Xavier in Japan and his plans for the

composed in India an Indian history of the mission in two parts. The first contained Xavier's Life; the FF. Enrique Enriquez and Francisco Perez, who had stayed in India with Xavier, supplied information; P. Manuel Teixeira, who had been with Xavier there also, collected much material. The Life appears to have been finished by Valignani in 1574; it was first published in the *Mon. Xaver.* (*cf. ibid.*, xxiii, xxiv, 199).

¹ Francis Xavier to Paolo da Camerino, Anton Gomes, Gaspar Berse, to the Jesuits of Goa, to Pedro da Silva, etc., dat. Kagoshima, Nov. 3 and 11, 1549 (*Mon. Xaver.*, I., 573-601, 642-655; *cf.* also H. J. COLERIDGE, S.J., *The Life and Letters of St. Francis Xavier*, II., new ed., London, 1881, 225-282); DELPLACE, *Le Catholicisme en Japon. S. Fr. Xavier et ses premiers successeurs*, Malines, 1909.

mission to China, up to the day in December 1552 when he died on the island of Sancian in sight of the coast of China, lie outside of the pontificate of Paul III. He had now proved himself to be already a great propagator of the kingdom of Christ. From Rome Xavier had been drawn to the farthest East, and from thence he was ever looking back to Rome. "I will," he wrote on the 5th of November 1549 from Kagoshima to Goa, "give an account to his Holiness the Pope, who is Christ's representative on earth and the shepherd of those who believe in Him, and also of all those who are on the point of coming to the knowledge of their Saviour and obedience to the Pope's spiritual jurisdiction."¹

Xavier and his master Ignatius both alike became what they were through the Papacy. The latter once spoke of Manresa as his grammar school,² his university was Rome. There the comrades of Montmartre received their call to form a new Order; there Ignatius met with the Church's approval of his designs, was chosen General, wrote the Constitutions of the Order, received from the Pope his sphere of work and spiritual authority; from thence he sent out his faithful followers into the wide world. The reputation and power of the Papacy were then shaken well-nigh to the ground; a great portion of the clergy was defiled by greed and unchastity; many convents were deserted or disorganized; the influence of the Church over the schools had, for the most part, vanished. Wide strata of the people were ignorant of and indifferent to sacred things; the stream of heresy from the north threatened to sweep over Europe in a flood. On the other hand, new worlds had been discovered; millions were waiting for

¹ Mon. Xaver., I., 599.

² RIBADENEIRA, De actis etc., n. 40 (Mon. Ignat., Ser. IV., i, 353, 354).

the message of salvation. It was therefore, so to speak, inevitable that a new Order should arise such as the Society of Jesus, with its devotion to the Roman See, its catechisms and spiritual exercises, its system of education, its message of war to error at home, and its message of the Gospel to the heathen abroad.

CHAPTER III.

THE TURKISH WAR.—THE MEETING BETWEEN PAUL III.
AND CHARLES V. AT LUCCA.—THE CONCILIAR QUESTION,
1541-1543

THE ambiguous attitude assumed by Charles V. at the close of the Diet of Ratisbon inflicted serious injury on the Imperial authority and on the Catholic cause.

The Pope, like the German Catholics, was filled with deep mistrust, a mistrust intensified by the representations made to him by Francis I.;¹ but the Protestants, as had all along been feared in Rome,² felt emboldened³ to make further encroachments by the concessions they had succeeded in exacting. The situation was made still worse by the unfortunate turn taken by the Turkish war. The consent of the Diet to a subsidy from the Estates had come too late; before the resolution was passed the troops of Ferdinand I. had raised the siege of Ofen and on the 21st of August 1541 had begun their enforced retreat. The Sultan, who appeared before Ofen on the 26th, deceived Isabella, Zapolya's widow, and by a combination of force and cunning made himself master of the capital of Hungary, which henceforth for one hundred and forty-five years was to remain subject to the Crescent. The whole country,

¹ Cf. Dandino's *report, dat. Lyon, Sept. 28, 1541. Nunz. di Francia, 2 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Cf. the letter in EHSSES, IV., 216, n. 4.

³ See JANSSEN-PASTOR,¹⁸ 512.

from the Danube to the Theiss, was incorporated in the Turkish empire.¹

With the Christian princes at variance with one another, Cardinal Aleander saw in the loss of the largest portion of Hungary the prelude to the subjugation of the whole of Europe to the house of Osman.²

In Rome the news aroused such alarm that it seemed to many as if the infidel were already at the gates of the city;³ not less was the consternation in the territories of the Hapsburgs. In Vienna the thought of a second siege filled men with terror, but fortunately the hereditary possessions of the house of Austria were left unmolested by the Turks; on the contrary, the Sultan on the 22nd of September left Ofen on his return march to Constantinople.⁴ One reason for this certainly was the extensive warlike preparations of the Emperor,⁵ who had determined in person to strike a blow at the Turkish power in its most opposite extremity, the city of Algiers. With this object in view, as soon as the Diet of Ratisbon was over he made his way by Trent to Milan and from there to Genoa; thence on the 10th of September 1541 he journeyed to Lucca to hold a conference with Paul III.⁶

¹ Cf. BUCHOLTZ, V., 153 *seq.*, 159 *seq.*; DE LEVA, III., 449 *seq.*; HUBER, IV., 80.

² See *letter of Sept. 12, 1541 (State Archives, Parma), in Appendix No. 8.

³ See N. Sernini's *report, dat. Rome, Sept. 17, 1541 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ Cf. ZINKEISEN, II., 845 *seq.*

⁵ Paul III. was made distrustful (see TURBA, Algier, 7, 8); precautionary measures were therefore taken in Rome (Le Legaz. di Serristori, 113 *seq.*; BENIGNI, Miscell., V., 170 *seq.*).

⁶ VANDENESSE, II., 190 *seq.* For the negotiations as to place of meeting, see DITTRICH, Contarini, 780 *seq.*; SIMONETTI, 7 *seq.* Cardinal Guidiccioni's *letter to Lucca, dat. Rome, Aug. 10, 1541 (State Archives, Lucca), gives interesting details.

The Pope, despite the representations of his physicians and of the French party, left Rome on the 27th of August,¹ leaving Cardinal Carpi behind as Legate.² On the 8th of September he entered Lucca in state, amid festive decorations and surrounded by Cardinals Farnese, Santaflora, Contarini, Henry of Portugal, Gambara, Cervini, Guidiccioni, and Trivulzio. He went first to the Cathedral and then to the episcopal palace, which was to be his resting-place.³ On the 10th of September Margaret, the wife of Ottavio Farnese and daughter of the Emperor, arrived, the latter himself coming on the 12th, accompanied by the Dukes of Ferrara, Florence, and Camerino. Paul III. had sent Cardinal Farnese and four other Cardinals to meet him at the Porta S. Donato. The two heads of Christendom exchanged greetings in the Cathedral. On the 13th of September Charles V. had a long conversation with the Pope in the bishop's palace. The latter returned the visit on the following day at the Palazzo della Signoria, where the Emperor was lodged. Return visits were paid to Paul III. on the 14th and 15th, and on the 16th he

¹ For the journey on which Siena was purposely avoided, see *the reports of A. Serristori of Aug. 2, 7, 31, and Sept. 3, 1541 (State Archives, Florence), *Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 22 (Secret Archives of the Vatican), and SIMONETTI, 13 *seq.*, 19. Samminiato wrote on Aug. 31, 1541, from Acquapendente: "S. S^{ia} questa mattina partendo da Acquapendente et entrando in su il Senese volse la sua guardia seco" (State Archives, Lucca, Anz., 621).

² Carpi was appointed on Aug. 12, 1541 (see Acta Consist. Cancell., Consistorial Archives, Vatican).

³ Cf. SIMONETTI'S full account (p. 19 *seq.*). See also the Diario in FUMI, Aumenti del Archivio di Lucca, Rocca S. Casciano, 1907, 44 *seq.* In the *Memorie di Lucca di M. BERTOLANI, f. 144 *seq.*, the lodgings of the Cardinals are mentioned. Contarini stayed at the Abbey of S. Frediano, Cervini at the Bishop's palace, and Farnese with V. Guinigi (State Archives, Lucca).

went to see the Emperor. The two final conferences took place on the 17th and 18th; Charles left Lucca on the 18th, while the Pope remained until the 20th.¹ On his way home he stopped at Bologna, Loreto, and Camerino; October was drawing to an end when he again entered Rome.²

To the mass of subjects claiming the attention of Pope and Emperor fresh material was added by the arrival of the news of the capture of Ofen,³ whereby the Turkish question was opened out afresh. The time at their disposal was much too short to admit of the numerous political, religious, and private differences between them being discussed and final decisions formed upon them.⁴

The point of first importance for the Emperor was to secure the Pope's aid in dispelling the menace of war from France, which was looming in the near foreground, on account of the attempt on the lives of the French diplomatists Rincon and Fregoso, and threatened to obstruct the expedition against Algiers. Paul III. promised to do his best, and while still in Lucca a capable diplomatist, Girolamo Dandino, was despatched to France. He was to urge the maintenance of the armistice and to lay before the French King, Charles's proposal that the Netherlands instead of Milan should be the dowry to

¹ See SIMONETTI, 29 *seq.*, 31 *seq.*; *cf.* MAZZATINTI, Archivi, V., 106. The Pope presented the Emperor with a valuable cross, two candlesticks, and a pax, works of Belli (see Lett. inedit. di C. Gualteruzzi di Fano, Pesaro, 1834, 42), and also gave him a Bull relative to half of the ecclesiastical income of the Netherlands (see Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 213).

² See Acta Consist. Cancell. (Consistorial Archives, Vatican) and the *notes of Cornelius de Fine in Cod. Ottob., 1614, f. 55 *seq.*, Vatican Library.

³ See HASENCLEVER in Mitteil. des österr. Instituts, XXVI., 305.

⁴ *Cf.* Corp. dipl. Port., IV., 398.

be brought by his daughter to the Duke of Orleans.¹ Paul III. had advised the cession of Savoy to Francis I., while the dispossessed Duke of that country would be compensated with Milan. He was probably led to suggest this scheme, which was rejected by Charles, by some *arrière pensée* with regard to Ottavio Farnese, whose name, however, had not yet been mentioned.² The Papal policy concerning Milan was dismissed in the same way as the recommendation that the Emperor, instead of attacking Algiers, should go directly to the aid of his brother Ferdinand.³ As regards the religious affairs of Germany, the Pope spoke openly on the Recess of Ratisbon, against the terms of which Contarini addressed a protest from Lucca to the Cardinal of Mayence.⁴

The Papal decision, which the Emperor wished for, on the Catholic League and the reform of the German Church had to be postponed, as there were not Cardinals enough in Lucca to form a consistory; still, a prospect of the gratification of his wishes was held before Charles.⁵ The question of the Council was also gone into thoroughly at Lucca.⁶ The Emperor now showed himself to be so far

¹ Dandino failed, as did N. Ardinghello, who was sent, on the return of the former, in the middle of Nov. 1541 (see PIEPER, Nuntiat., 122 *seq.*).

² See DE LEVA, III., 455; *cf. ibid.*, 476, n. 3, according to whom there was talk of Siena as well as Lucca, but no authentic proof of this is forthcoming (see CARDAUNS in Quellen und Forschs., XII., 194). From Antella's *letter of Dec. 18, 1540, it is probable that Paul III. was then thinking of Milan for Ottavio (State Archives, Florence), see Appendix No. 7.

³ See JOVIUS, Hist., i, 40; *cf.* TURBA, 38 *seq.*

⁴ See *supra*, p. 477 *seq.*

⁵ See DE LEVA, III., 456; DITTRICH, Contarini, 788 *seq.*; HASEN-CLEVER in Mitteil. des österr. Instituts, XXVI., 305; SIMONETTI, 37 *seq.*

⁶ *Cf.* EHSES, IV., 206 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 4, c. 16, n. 1, 2; DITTRICH, 788; KORTE, 48 *seq.*; PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 141 *seq.*

compliant to the Pope's wishes as to be ready to accept Vicenza as the place of meeting. The Pope, who had spared himself no pains to obtain, before his meeting with Charles should take place, the acquiescence of Venice in this choice, received an inopportune check at this very moment by the final announcement, after long delays, of the Republic's refusal, actuated out of consideration for Turkey and France.¹ It appears that the Emperor, with an appeal to the Recess of Ratisbon, suggested Trent as a place specially suitable.² On this as on the other questions under consideration no definite pronouncement was reached at Lucca; the Pope reserved himself for consultation with the Sacred College.

On the 28th of September the Emperor, in whose suite was Ottavio Farnese, left the harbour of Spezia with his galleys. By a rapid descent on Algiers, which under the Turkish Pasha, Hassan Aga, had become a nest of piracy, he hoped to put an end to the almost unceasing pillage of the coasts of Spain, Naples, and Sicily and to divert the Sultan from an attack on Austria. The latter object was attained, but the undertaking against Algiers was a total failure.

This had been foreseen by experienced observers, for at the advanced season of the year violent storms might be expected with certainty. Paul III. had already drawn the Emperor's attention to this at Lucca.³ The obstinate determination of Charles to carry out his plan was a grave mistake which he had to rue bitterly. When, on the 20th of October, the African coast came in sight, the sea

¹ Letter of the nuncio in Venice, the Bishop of Chiusi, to Farnese, of Sept. 3, 1541; *cf.* for this and the foregoing negotiations with Venice, CAPASSO, Legati, 32-34.

² EHSES, IV. 207, n. 1; KORTE, 49; SIMONETTI, 36 *seq.*

³ See TURBA, as quoted in n. 2, p. 18.

was so stormy that the landing of the troops had to be put off for three days. Even then heavy seas hindered the disembarkation of cavalry, artillery, and provisions. The troops, 22,000 in number, pitched their camp before the city; they were full of courage and assurance, but all their hopes were soon shattered by the inclemency of the elements. During the evening of the 24th of October a storm broke out which lasted all night; torrents of rain, with the volume of waterspouts, submerged the camp, so that the soldiers were wading knee-deep in slush and water. On the following morning the storm had risen to hurricane pitch and in a short space of time annihilated before the eyes of the army ten great galleys and more than a hundred transport vessels. Even more sensibly felt than the sacrifice of life demanded by this tempest was the loss in artillery, ammunition, and food-stuffs. The critical position of the camp was intensified, as the soldiers could not make use of their rain-soaked muskets against the onsets of the enemy. It was a desperate business to ward off the incessant attacks; the courage and presence of mind of the Emperor alone saved the army from total ruin. As the most necessary supplies were lacking, the troops were compelled at great sacrifice and amid persistent engagements with the enemy to fall back upon Cape Matifou, where the remainder of the fleet had taken refuge. Here the soldiers were got on board, but fresh storms brought loss and disaster on the homeward voyage; at last, on the 1st of December, the Emperor landed at Carthagena.¹

¹ Cf. together with SCHOMBURGK, *Die Geschichtschreibung über den Zug Karls V. gegen Algiers*, Leipzig, 1875; TURBA in *Archiv für Österr. Gesch.*, LXXVI. (1890), 25 *seqq.*, who also examines the question of Charles's responsibility for the failure of the expedition (see L. PASTOR in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XII., 184 *seq.*; see also SEGRE, Carlo II. di Savoia, 21; ARMSTRONG, II., 7 *seq.*; *Arch. Stor. Sicil.*, XXXI., 372).

When in the middle of November news reached Rome of the unhappy issue of the Algerian expedition, the central point of public interest was, together with discussions on ecclesiastical reform, the question of the Council.

Immediately after the conference at Lucca the Pope had thrown himself with energy into the preparations for the Council.¹ Cardinal Farnese had already on the 5th of October 1541 commissioned from Bologna two of the most prominent members of the Sacred College, Contarini and Aleander, to make proposals regarding the time as well as the place of the Council irrespective of the circumstance whether the Christian princes were at peace or at war, or whether there was agreement between them or not. The persons named were also to consider carefully the reform of the German Church as desired by the Emperor at Ratisbon, to propose personages fitted for the task, and to draw up a draft of instructions for the preachers. All this was to be got ready so as to admit of a speedier settlement on the return of the Pope to Rome.² As Aleander fell ill Contarini took the work in hand alone. It was ready by the middle of October; as introductory to the reform of Germany, Contarini recommended the appointment as nuncio of Giovanni Morone, Bishop of Modena, to be accompanied by the Scotsman, Robert Wauchope, and two members of the Society of Jesus. With regard to the Council, Contarini abode by his opinion of its urgent necessity, which he emphasized with great precision. On the question of locality his unfortunate experiences had brought a change of mind and he also

¹ Cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 791. "There cannot now," says Korte (p. 48), "be the slightest doubt of the Pope's sincerity in wishing the Council to be held."

² Farnese to Contarini, dat. Oct. 5, 1541, in DITTRICH, Regesten, 385; cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 791; EHSSES, IV., 208, n. 2.

rejected Trent. Any German town he ruled out, not only on account of the existing unrest and the strength of Protestantism, but also because of the opposition of other nations. Besides, the Pope would be putting his life in danger if he were to visit such a cold climate at his advanced age.

Yet a further reason there was; since the Recess of Ratisbon had demanded a council in Germany, it might seem a concession of weakness to give way on this point, as if the Council should assemble in virtue of a resolution of the Diet and not in virtue of the Papal authority. A council in Spain was out of the question, while to a city in France no Germans would go; thus no other country remained but Italy. Here, since the Germans were opposed to Milan and the French to Ferrara and Bologna, Mantua had the strongest recommendations. It was near Germany, was an Imperial city, although not wholly subject to the Emperor, and offered all the requirements for such an assembly. Since the Germans did not travel during the winter, the right time would be eight days after Easter. As to the Recess of Ratisbon, it called for no further consideration, having been passed without the co-operation, indeed without the knowledge of the Legate and nuncio.¹

With these well-grounded proposals Paul III. was in substantial agreement. All the efforts of the Imperialists to turn the Pope's choice on a German city were in vain. They only gained one point, that a final decision should be deferred until Morone, appointed on the 7th of November 1541 nuncio-extraordinary to the Diet at Spires, should have

¹ EHSES, IV., 208 *seq.* Cf. the *report of N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga of Nov. 11, 1541: "M'ero scordato scriver di sopra come io ho inteso che facendosi il concilio si ragiona incominciario a Pasqua o al più lungo a quello del Spirito Santo" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

given his report on the opinion of the German Catholics; in the meantime, Ardinghello, who had been sent to France on the 11th of November, would also have furnished fuller information on the attitude of Francis I.¹ On December the 17th Paul III. addressed a request to the latter as well as to the Emperor that they would allow their Cardinals to come to Rome to take part in the deliberations there to be held on the question of the General Council.²

Francis I. adhered, even after this fresh exhortation of the Pope, to his old standpoint. Out of consideration for the Protestants and the Turks he was now, as before, against a Council;³ his objections to the Cardinals' journey were put so strongly that the nuncio Capodiferro saw there was little to be hoped for.⁴ Paul III., nevertheless, held firmly to his plan. On the 3rd of January 1542 he discussed both the time and place of the Council with his Cardinals. They were all agreed that Whitsunday (May 28) should be adhered to as the latest date for the opening. The opinions as to place varied widely; besides Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, and Piacenza, Trent was also strongly recommended; no determination, however, was yet arrived at.⁵ On January the 4th Morone left Modena on his journey to Germany,⁶ where twice already he had

¹ Cf. EHSSES, IV., 207 *seq.*, 210 *seq.*; KORTE, 50 *seq.* For Morone's appointment, see Acta Consist. in EHSSES, IV., 206, n. 5.

² EHSSES, IV., 212. Cf. Ruggieri's *report of Dec. 19, 1541 (State Archives, Modena).

³ See Capodiferro's, Dandino's, and Ardinghello's reports in EHSSES, IV., 205 *seqq.* Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 4, c. 16, n. 8.

⁴ See Capodiferro in EHSSES, IV., 214, 215 *seq.*

⁵ Together with Contarini's letter of Jan. 7, 1542, in Quellen und Forschungen, II., 217 *seq.*, see also N. Sernini's *report of Jan. 4, 1542 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); see Appendix, No. 12.

⁶ LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 398.

supported the interests of the Holy See with distinguished success.¹ In accordance with Contarini's proposal he had, as colleagues in the reform of ecclesiastical affairs, Robert Wauchope and three sons of St. Ignatius: Peter Faber, Nicolas Bobadilla, and Claude Le Jay.²

In Trent and Brixen Morone left traces of his reforming activity. In Munich he dealt with Duke William of Bavaria on the subject, and in Dillingen with the Bishop of Augsburg and the Cathedral Chapter. To the latter he made serious representations on the disregard of celibacy, on the lavish tables, drinking bouts, gaming and hunting parties in which the clergy indulged, and on their ignorance and want of mental culture. The capitular clergy listened to his remonstrances willingly, and showed a disposition to alter their manner of living. The Bishop, who was counted one of the most learned of the Prince-Bishops of Germany, thanked Morone for the Papal messages delivered to him and said that he would do his utmost to give effect to those admonitions; at the same time he deeply deplored that the predecessors of Paul III. had not twenty years before taken the reformation of Germany in hand. Now, in his opinion, their efforts would be fruitless since the bishops, even with the best wish to do so, could effect nothing more. He proceeded to enumerate the chief hindrances: the exemptions of the Chapters, the ungovernable character of the German nobles, the support which the bad example of the clergy in moral relations finds in the licence of the Lutherans, the tyranny of the secular princes, and the deficiency of Catholic priests. Even from a council, the Bishop remarked, he no longer hoped for a remedy for such great disorders unless Germany first became united and laid aside her particular dissensions. In the course of

¹ KORTE, p. 52.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 104 *seq.*

these arguments he attacked now the Bavarians, now the Emperor and the other princes. Morone met this despairing pessimism with exhortations to pluck up courage and not to follow the example of the soured and listless who, while they bewail the past and despair about the future, stand with folded hands and let the opportunities of the present slip away, while the bad goes from worse to worse. The bishop must not imitate such, but use his gifts and learning in God's service, and if for the reasons adduced he cannot reckon on the full extent of his jurisdiction, he yet ought to try at least and unite the few souls over whom his authority extends.¹

Apart from the ecclesiastical reforms which Morone was to introduce with the co-operation of the German bishops, Contarini's instructions also comprised important business bearing on the Pope's entrance into the Catholic League, the Turkish war, and lastly the Council.² As the document relating to the Catholic alliance contained some expressions prejudicial to the Papal jurisdiction, Paul III. wished them to be recast in such a way as securely to establish

¹ Report of Feb. 8, 1542, in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 402 *seq.* The pessimistic description given by the Bishop of Augsburg of the state of things even in those parts of Germany which remained Catholic, was confirmed later to Morone by Cardinal Albert of Mayence (see LAEMMER, 412 *seq.*). For Morone and reform, see PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 290; PIEPER, 142, n. 3; and DUHR in *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theologie*, XXI., 594 *seq.*, and *Gesch. der Jesuiten*, 7 *seq.*, 16 *seq.*

² RAYNALDUS (1542, n. 2 *seq.*) gives the text of the Instruction, dat. Jan. 9, 1542, from a very corrupt copy which PALLAVICINI (l. 4, c. 17) uses, a manuscript from the Secret Archives of the Vatican. There is also a copy in the *Sec. Arch. Vat. in Varia Polit.*, 20, f. 238. See also EHSES, IV., 214 *seq.* Another copy in the *Graziani Archivis, Città di Castello, Istruzioni*, I., 320 *seq.* For Contarini as the composer, see PIEPER, 142.

his rights. As a subsidy the Pope was willing to give, not, as was demanded, a fourth, but a sixth only of the whole. He was ready to send 5000 men against the Turks if the Emperor would command the army in person, otherwise only half that number, and even that amount merely in the event of the Papal States being unmenaced by a Turkish landing.

With regard to the Council, Morone's instructions were to announce the Pope's determination to summon one, but at the same time to state the reasons why the place of meeting could not be Germany. In the first place, the Pope wished to take part in it himself, or at least to be not far away, and at his great age it would be impossible for him to undertake the journey to or encounter the climate of Germany. Further, it was to be feared that owing to the agitated state of that country the treatment of ecclesiastical questions there would only heat men's tempers the more and make the breaches between them still wider, even to the outbreak of war, a thing most repugnant to the Pope, whose wishes were directed only to the restoration of peace in Christendom. Paul III. wished, however, in the choice of a place to consult as much as possible the convenience of the German people; he therefore recommended in the first place Mantua, a city lying almost at the foot of the Alps, in the neighbourhood of Germany, and in other respects peculiarly suited. In case this proposal could not possibly be carried out he named in the second place Ferrara, also very favourably situated and well fitted for the purpose; since, however, the latter place, although certainly a fief of the Church, but not under immediate Papal rule, could not with certainty be offered by the Pope, the Legate might propose Piacenza or Bologna, cities of the Papal States; he was also fully empowered, if the Germans were in agreement with him on the point, to offer definitely one

or other of these cities. Whitsunday was to be fixed upon as the date of opening.¹

Morone, who in the course of his journey had discussed the subject of reform as well as that of the Council with Duke William of Bavaria at Munich and with the Bishop of Augsburg at Dillingen, reached Spires on the 8th of February,² where the Diet was opened on the following day. The German princes were divided, as formerly, on the question of the Council. Duke William of Bavaria declared the Synod to be absolutely necessary and was in favour of its immediate opening. Mantua he preferred to any other place, but, if this were impossible, Trent; but he announced his intention of agreeing entirely with all that the Pope decided.³ Morone was displeased at finding on his arrival at Spires that almost all the spiritual princes were absent, so that there was no means of coming to an understanding with them. He regretted this all the more as he had a suspicion that the Imperial orators, Montfort and Naves, and King Ferdinand as well, were inclined to consent to the settlement of religious affairs by a national

¹ The proposal of the above-named four cities and of the Whitsuntide term correspond with the results of the consistorial discussion on Jan. 3, 1542 (*cf. supra*, p. 133). On Jan. 28 Farnese wrote to Morone that he would adhere to his proposal of those four places as being the most suitable for the purpose; he recommended Bologna for preference, but Morone was to report on the feeling there so that further steps should be taken in accordance therewith (PIEPER, 176). Farnese wrote in the same sense to Poggio on Feb. 5, observing that Trent in itself was certainly not regarded with dislike by the Pope, but that the latter saw objections to it in other quarters (Francis I.) and therefore fell back on the other four cities: Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, Piacenza (EHSES, IV., 216 *seq.*).

² See Verallo's report of Feb. 12, 1542 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); *cf.* Morone in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 403.

³ Morone to Farnese, dat. 1542, Feb. 8 (LAEMMER, 401).

council or by another Diet¹ in order to guarantee the help of the Protestants against the Turks. The King of the Romans, moreover, who was then only occupied with the demand for support throughout the Empire against the Turks, saw with dissatisfaction that the Pope's representatives were bent on separate negotiations with the Catholic Estates.² Already in the first audience, given on the 9th of February, he tried to induce Morone to explain the task with which he was entrusted in a session of the Diet. Morone had to refuse, since he was not instructed to this effect and had no letters of credence to the Diet but only to certain individual princes.³ He told the King and the vice-chancellor Naves that he was not at Spire to negotiate with the Diet but with the Emperor and the King of the Romans, in the Pope's name. On further pressure, however, from Ferdinand he applied through Farnese to the Pope for power to address the Diet on the subject both of the Turkish war and of the Council.⁴

Ferdinand thought, as Morone did not fail to observe, that in the public session no one would venture to declare himself against the Recess of Ratisbon, while he feared that the nuncio might succeed in isolated negotiations in winning over individuals to a hostile position.⁵ The King was also displeased at the promptitude with which Morone had announced openly that the Pope had resolved to open the Council at Whitsuntide.⁶ The Bishop of Spire, who was the only ecclesiastical prince present at the time

¹ Same to same, dat. 1542, Feb. 10 (LAEMMER, 404). Cf. KORTE, 52 *seq.*

² Same to same, dat. 1542, Feb. 10 (LAEMMER, 404, 411). Cf. KORTE, 53.

³ Same to same, dat. 1542, Feb. 10 (LAEMMER, 407 *seq.*).

⁴ *Ibid.* (LAEMMER, 409, 410).

⁵ LAEMMER, 404.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 410 *seq.*

of the nuncio's arrival, said that he would accept the Pope's orders, but recommended the Council to be held in Germany in order to cut off all further excuse for calumnious statements about the Holy Father; he proposed Metz or Trent, both of which places in a certain degree were in Germany and yet out of Germany.¹ The Cardinal of Mayence, on the contrary, with whom after his arrival Morone had long consultations, declared that the hindering of the council in Germany would be dangerous even although certain bishops were in favour of it, but the speedy assemblage of the Synod he thought very necessary.²

In a letter written by Farnese on the 6th of March³ Morone received the permission desired by Ferdinand. He was now at liberty to lay before the Diet all his instructions regarding the Turkish subsidy and the Council. As regards the Council, he was to explain that the Pope, who had always been ready to hold the Synod and had offered it, was now more than ever determined to carry out his wishes. In order on his part to remove every doubt and impediment, the Pope would also be glad to summon the General Council to Trent, if none of the cities of which prior mention had been made were found suitable.⁴ With regard to the opening of the assembly, the Pope

¹ LAEMMER, 404.

² Morone to Farnese, dat. 1542, Feb. 20 (LAEMMER, 413).

³ In PIEPER, 177-181. For portion relating to Council, see also EHSES, IV., 217 *seq.*

⁴ KORTE (p. 54) thinks that the Pope's sudden compliance in the matter of Trent is to be explained by the conviction at Rome that neither Francis I. nor the Emperor wished the Council to be held. The danger of the situation was thus diminished, while at the same time a more favourable complexion was given to the Pope's obligingness. The actual course of events showed, on the contrary, that the Pope was acting quite honestly in trying to obviate the slightest pretext for objection on the part of the Emperor or Germany.

even now would prefer that it should be fixed for Whitsuntide; but if, as time was advancing, it should be found desirable to postpone the date, he left the settlement of that point to Morone's discretion; as soon as his answer was received the Bull of summons would be prepared.

On the receipt of these instructions Morone, on the 23rd of March, laid before the Diet the Pope's proposals regarding the subsidy for the Turkish war and the Council.¹ He spoke strongly of the Pope's determination, and remarked that matters had hitherto been in suspense only at the request of the Emperor and King Ferdinand. In accordance with his previous instructions he unfolded the reasons which had led the Pope ostensibly to object to a German meeting-place for the Council; he mentioned the four cities which had been proposed at first, but then explained that his Holiness, if these places for various reasons should be deemed less suitable, offered to summon the Council to Trent in order to meet more fully the wishes of the German nation and to obviate all hindrances. As the date of opening he proposed the 15th of August, the festival of the Assumption of Our Lady.

The Protestants, who had abstained from appearing at the session, at once raised a protest² against a Council the summons to which depended on a Pope, while the Electors and Catholic Estates were satisfied with the proposals. Subsequently, on the 30th of March, Morone received a fresh letter from Farnese of the 21st according to which the seat of the Council had been again dealt with in

¹ *Propositio facta per Io. Moronum episcopum Mutinensem nuntium Apostolicum in dieta Spirensi die 23 Martii 1542* (EHSES, IV., 218 *seq.*). Cf. also Morone's letter to Farnese of March 28 in LAEMMER, 420, and that to E. Gonzaga of March 29 in SOLMI, Contarini, 90 *seq.*; cf. also WINKELMANN, III., 252.

² EHSES, IV., 219 *seq.*

consistory on March the 15th, and besides Trent, Cambrai had also been taken into consideration, the latter appearing to a majority of Cardinals to be preferable to Trent on account of its situation and out of regard for the existing political relations. To the Pope both places were acceptable; Cambrai indeed was less convenient owing to its being further off; but as the object of the Council was the general good of Christendom, he would give his decision in favour of that one of the two cities which should be considered most adapted for that object. The nuncio was to confer with the King on the subject and with any other person whom he thought it good to speak to.¹

Morone was upset by this message.² He feared, not without reason, that fresh suspicions would be aroused in the Germans concerning the sincerity of the Pope's intentions. On the 1st of April, having on that day received the verbal reply of the Estates to his former proposals, he laid before the Diet, on the advice of King Ferdinand, a fresh proposition in which, besides Trent and the four Italian cities, he recommended Cambrai.³ Previously, however, he had already made corresponding communications to the Electors of Mayence and Treves, and to Bavaria and some other Catholics.⁴ As he had feared, this new proposal was no better received by the Catholics than by the Protestants; even on the Catholic side it was suspected

¹ In PIEPER, 181-183. Cardinal E. Gonzaga, *writing to the Marchese del Vasto, says of the consistory of March 15, 1542 (*cf.* EHSES, IV., 218, n. 1): "Il card. Trivultio ha nominato Genova per luogo confidente a tutti i principi christiani da congregarvi il concilio, della qual cosa ognino e massimamente il Papa s' é maravigliato." Cod. Barb. lat., 5790, f. 151, Vatican Library.

² Morone to Farnese, dat. April 3, 1542 (LAEMMER, 424-428).

³ EHSES, IV., 220.

⁴ Morone to Farnese, dat. April 3, 1542 (LAEMMER, 424 *seq.*).

that the Pope had no intention of holding the Council and was trying in this way to evade it. The nuncio was accused of disingenuousness and vacillation.¹ On the 4th of April Morone received the written answer of the Estates,² which corresponded to the verbal declaration of their deputies made on April the 1st. Cambrai was not even mentioned; on the other hand, the Estates declared that if no more suitable city in the Empire, Ratisbon for instance, or Cologne, was to be obtained from the Pope, they wished, in that case, for Trent in preference to the other places named, and they earnestly begged that the Council might be convened and held without further delay.

The attitude of Ferdinand towards the demands of the Protestant³ Estates caused Morone and the nuncio Verallo not less anxiety than the question of the Council. The Papal representatives were not sparing of warnings against further concessions; but the King had an eye for his necessities which forced him to give his consent to things of which at first he had taken no thought.⁴ By the Recess of the 11th of April the Ratisbon conditions of peace, together with the suspension of all causes affecting matters of religion pending before the Imperial Courts, were extended over another five years. As regards the Council, the Recess held to the 15th of August as the date for its opening and reiterated the wishes expressed in the letter of April the 4th; the protest of the new religionists was

¹ Morone to Farnese (LAEMMER, 427); Morone to Farnese, dat. April 4, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 221, n. 1).

² EHSES, IV., 221.

³ Cf. Verallo's letter of March 30, 1542 (Nunziat. di Germania, Secret Archives of the Vatican). See also Morone's report of March 28, 1542, in LAEMMER, 421 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. Verallo's *report of April 6, 1542 (LAEMMER, 421 *seq.*).

expressly mentioned.¹ Ferdinand justified his fresh compliance by the state of his affairs which, at the present juncture, forced him to shut his eyes.² The King of the Romans was soon to learn from experience what the Turkish war subsidy voted in the Diet of Spires was worth.

The Diet had promised to raise 40,000 foot and 8000 horse soldiers within six months. These troops were to be assembled at Vienna by the beginning of May; but the promise was not kept either with regard to time or numbers. It was the beginning of July before 30,000 were in readiness, in addition to which Paul III., to the disgust of the French,³ sent 3000 infantry and 500 horsemen,⁴ somewhat more than he had stipulated; these troops reached Vienna on the 3rd of July. With the contingents raised by Hungary and the Austrian and Bohemian Estates the host increased to upwards of 55,000 men. Want of money, with the accompanying lack of discipline and insubordination among the soldiery, put a check to any active operations. At last, in September, the army

¹ See *Neue Sammlung der Reichsabschiede*, II., 444 *seq.*; BUCHOLTZ, V., 16 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 521; EHSSES, IV., 223, n. 2; KORTE, 55 *seq.*

² Cf. Verallo's *report, April 12, 1542 (*Nunziat. di Germania*, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ "Dicono il Papa inclinar alla banda imperiale, anchora che mostri pur di starsene nella sua neutralità, perche S. B. ha chiariti Francesi, che vuol aiutar l' Imperator et il re de Romani contra 'l Turco, di che non si contentano molto," *wrote Cardinal E. Gonzaga to the Marchese del Vasto on March 27, 1542. *Cod. Barb. lat.*, 5790, f. 145 (Vatican Library).

⁴ The infantry was commanded by Paolo Vitelli, the cavalry by the Marchese Sforza Pallavicini (great-grandfather of the Cardinal). Cf. the *briefs to Sforza Pallavicini of Jan. 5, 1542, to Ferdinand I., and to the "Protonotarius de Medicis," appointed commissary-general, the two latter of May 29, 1542. *Min. brev. Arm.*, 41, t. 23, n. 12; t. 24, n. 446, 456 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

took the field. If this ended in a scandalous disaster the chief blame rested on the incompetent commander-in-chief, Joachim, Elector of Brandenburg, and the spirit of disaffection among the unpaid soldiers which culminated in open mutiny. As the assault on Ofen by the Papal troops was not supported by their German comrades, the attempt failed; without having effected the most meagre results Brandenburg decided to withdraw; and the great army disbanded itself "amid the derision of all Christendom."¹

In a consistory held on the 26th of April 1542, Paul III., notwithstanding the French² opposition, finally decided to summon the Council to Trent³ out of regard for the wishes of Germany. After this important matter had been discussed again on the 5th and 12th of May in consistory the Bull was read aloud on the 22nd and its publication agreed to.⁴ This took place on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul.⁵

¹ Cf. KÁROLYI, *A német birodalom nagy hádi vállata Magyarországon 1542 ben*, Budapest, 1880; HUBER, IV., 86 *seq.*; TRAUT, Joachim II. und der Türkenfeldzug von 1542, Gummersbach, 1892; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 524 *seq.* In 1543 Fünfkirchen and Gran were taken by the Turks (see BUCHOLTZ, V., 189 *seq.*; HAMMER, III., 248 *seq.*; ZINKEISEN, II., 850 *seq.*).

² See in Vol. XI., App. No. 37, the report of N. Sernini of March 18, 1542 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ Cf. Acta Consist. and Farnese's letter of April 28, 1542, in EHSES, IV., 223, and the *reports of N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga of April 22 (see App. No. 14) and April 30, 1542. In the latter it says: There was a consistory "Mercordi: N. S. ordinò che si spedisca la bolla del concilio a Trento." Then the question arose, who was to be Legate? "si dice di Contarini, Parisio e Chiete et S. Croce; ma Dio sa se bisogneranno et sel Turco vien così potente, come si dice, si penserà più alla guerra che al concilio" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁴ See Acta Consist. in EHSES, IV., 223.

⁵ See Farnese's letter of June 29 in EHSES, IV., 232; cf. MERKLE, I., 416 *seq.*

In the important document drawn up by Sadoletto¹ and dated May the 22nd, Paul III. glanced back at his endeavours to promote the Council since the beginning of his pontificate, on his various earlier convocations and the reasons then existing for the frustration of his plans; he then announced that he was determined to wait no longer for the consent of any princes, but fix his eyes only on the will of Almighty God and the general good of Christendom. He summoned the Council to Trent on All Saints' Day, the 1st of November.²

The Conciliar Bull met with a most unfavourable reception. Francis I. met it with a flat refusal; he declared to the nuncio Capodiferro that since Trent had been chosen without his consent, and was a city which offered no security to his subjects, he would not suffer the Bull to be published in his kingdom. The nuncio made counter-representations in vain. The King angrily remarked he would see to it if anyone dared to act contrary to his command; his determination to refuse recognition to the Council of Trent, which served only the Emperor's interests, was irrevocable.³

Not less troublous were the experiences of the nuncio Verallo and the Papal private chamberlain Otto Truchsess von Waldburg, who was sent specially to convey the Bull to the Diet opened at Nuremberg in August 1542. Both gave notice of the Council⁴ in lengthy orations to the

¹ This interesting fact, hitherto unknown, I took from a *report from N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, May 27, 1542: "L' ultimo consistorio fù lunedì passato, nel qual il card. Salviati lesse la bolla del concilio fatta dal card. Sadoletto" (Gonzaga Arch., Mant.).

² Best and latest copy of the Bull, also of all editions of the Tridentine Canons and Decrees, in EHSES, IV., 226-231.

³ See the nuncio Capodiferro's report of July 24, 1542, in EHSES, IV. 233.

⁴ See EHSES, IV., 234 *seq.*, 236 *seq.*

Diet on August the 13th. While the Protestants renewed their protest, the Catholic Estates gave answer to the envoys of Paul III. first orally on the 17th of August and afterwards in writing; they thanked the Pope, and expressed their readiness to attend the Council either in their own persons or, in case of hindrance, in those of their envoys and procurators.¹ King Ferdinand, in his letter of reply to the Pope of September the 21st, 1542, notified his joyful readiness in complying.² While the Protestants had nothing but ridicule for the Council, the Catholics, as Verallo learned in private conversation, doubted for the most part whether the Synod, in view of the disturbed state of Europe, would ever meet at all.³ In the Recess of the Diet the Council was not even mentioned, an omission significant of the general opinion.⁴ Otto Truchsess, in obedience to his orders, went from Nuremberg to Poland, where, on the 15th of October, he gave intimation of the Council to King Sigismund in Cracow.⁵ He likewise presented the Bull to the Archbishop of Gnesen, who forthwith communicated its contents to his clergy and the episcopate in a Provincial Synod.⁶

The summoning of the Council called forth marked signs of disfavour from the Emperor. This was connected with the neutrality strongly maintained by Paul III. and the renewed outbreak of war with France

¹ EHSES, IV., 237, n. 3, and 237 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, IV., 248; *cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 417.

³ See Farnese's letter of Sept. 4, 1542, in EHSES, IV., 237, n. 3. *Cf.* the *report of Verallo, Aug. 18, 1542, *Nunziat. di Germania* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ *Cf.* KORTE, 58.

⁵ EHSES, IV., 259-261.

⁶ The Archbishop of Gnesen (Petrus Gamrat) to Paul III., dat. Krakau, Nov. 7, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 279 *seq.*).

Paul III. had done all in his power to prevent the unholy conflict between the two most powerful sovereigns of the West. When the Pope in December 1541 sent his chamberlain Giovanni Ricci to Siena to report to Granvelle on the ineffectual mission of Ardinghello, the Emperor's representative thanked him in the warmest terms for the Pope's intervention in behalf of peace.¹ At the end of March 1542 Ricci was again sent by the Pope,² always hopeful of maintaining peace, to the two contending princes.³ He carried with him on this occasion a brief for Francis I. with an autograph postscript by Paul III. containing earnest exhortations to peace.⁴ Not till the 24th of May did Ricci, eagerly awaited by the Pope, return to Rome,⁵ only to set forth again immediately on the 30th of May to hasten⁶ with fresh pacific messages to the French and Imperial courts. On the 7th of June he reached

¹ See Appendix No. 11 for Ricci's *report of Dec. 29, 1541 (Ricci Archives, Rome).

² On March 29, 1542, N. Sernini *wrote to Cardinal E. Gonzaga: "Ho inteso di nuovo per buona via che N. S. ha buona speranza che debbia succedere pace fra l' Imp^{ro} et Francia, pure il più che non credono, ricordandose delle cose passate, pure l'occasione fanno mutare proposito" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cf. the *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga to the Marchese del Vasto (Cod. Barb. lat., 5790, f. 156, Vatican Library).

³ See RAYNALDUS, 1542, n 21.

⁴ See the *brief of March 27, 1542, in Appendix No. 13, from the original in Ricci Archives, Rome. Ricci left on March 28; see the *report of A. Serristori of March 29, 1542 (State Archives, Florence, Med. 3264).

⁵ See Serristori's letter of May 26, 1542. Ricci on his return reported the Pope's longing and hope for peace in his *letters of May 1, 5, 8, and 14, 1542 (State Archives, Florence).

⁶ See the *brief to Charles V. of May 29, 1542 (Ricci Archives, Rome). Cf. Farnese's *letter to Poggio of June 4, 1542 (Chigi Library, Rome, LIII., 65).

Francis I.¹ Although the King's demeanour offered but little prospect of peace, Ricci, on the 16th of June, was with the Emperor with new proposals of mediation.²

In Italy, at this time, the renewal of hostilities was looked upon as inevitable. Even the Pope's optimism was shaken,³ and he began to see that he was cherishing but dwindling hopes of the prevention of the unholy strife. Nevertheless he was determined, under cover of his unbroken neutrality,⁴ to press to the utmost his proposals for mediation.

The Imperial ambassador Aguilar and the Roman envoy of the Duke of Florence took every opportunity at this time to influence Paul III. to become the partisan of Charles V. When the war actually broke out in July they redoubled their efforts in this direction, but without success. They reminded the Pope that he himself previously had undertaken to declare against Francis if he made common cause with the Turk. Paul III. thereupon replied that he was only waiting for Ricci's return,⁵ which took place on the 22nd of July.⁶ It was evident that he had effected nothing.⁷ Still the Pope's attitude underwent

¹ See Ricci's *letter to Farnese, June 15, 1542 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); Lett. di Princ., XII., 334 *seq.* (*cf.* PIEPER, 124).

² N. Sernini reported on July 24, 1542, on Ricci's mission (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ On June 20, 1542, Lattanzio Tolomei *wrote: To-day the Pope came back "et le prime parole che disse al Card. de Viseo [M. de Sylva], chelli andò incontro farono queste: Anco non è rotta la guerra intra Francesi et l' Imperatore" (State Archives, Siena).

⁴ *Cf.* L. Tolomei's *report of July 6, 1542 (State Archives, Siena).

⁵ Legazioni di A. Serristori, 128.

⁶ L. Tolomei's *report of July 22, 1542, who adds: "Ricci si mostra in cera molto allegro" (State Archives, Siena). *Cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1542, n. 22; PIEPER, 124.

⁷ L. Tolomei's *report of July 24, 1542 (State Archives, Siena). *Cf.* Serristori's *letters of July 24 and 31, 1542 (State Archives, Florence).

no change. He thought it too hazardous to declare openly against Francis I., since then the latter might apostatize. In that case, he represented to the Emperor, the French King would seize upon the property of the Church and then become a more powerful opponent of Spain than before.¹ When on the 31st of July Ricci gave a report of his mission in consistory, Paul III. deplored with emotion the war between Francis and Charles, but no decision was reached.² On August the 7th, with the consent of the whole Sacred College, the Pope appointed two of the most famous and most experienced Cardinals to be Legates for peace: Contarini was to go to the Emperor, Sadoletto to the King of France.³ The departure of the latter was prepared with such despatch that he was ready to start on the 17th.⁴ Paul III. once more was now confident of a good result,⁵ but the unexpected death of Contarini necessitated the appointment of a successor; the Pope first thought of Morone, but afterwards gave the Legation

¹ See Cardinal Farnese's *letter to Poggio of Aug. 7, 1542 (Chigi Library, Rome, LIII., 65).

² See N. Sernini's *report to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, Aug. 1, 1542, who adds: "S. Sta mostra haver ancor speranza di pace" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ That the appointment took place not on the 5th but on the 7th August, as EHSES (IV., 283) insists, is established by N. Sernini's *report of Aug. 7, 1542 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), by that of *L. Tolomei of the same day (State Archives, Siena), and by the *letter of Cardinal Farnese to Poggio of Aug. 7, 1542 (Chigi Library, Rome, LIII., 65).

⁴ See Farnese's *letter of Aug. 19, 1542, in Appendix No. 17 (Chigi Library, Rome); cf. the *letter of N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, Aug. 11, 1542 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The briefs which Sadoletto took with him are dated Aug. 17 (RAYNALDUS, 1542, n. 27, and *Min. brev. arm., 41, t. 25, n. 683 *seq.*; *ibid.*, n. 688: *Delph. Franciae; n. 689: *Reginae Navarrae; n. 690: *Cancell.; n. 692: *Card. Turonens. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ See L. Tolomei's *report, Aug. 12, 1542 (State Archives, Siena).

to the Portuguese Cardinal Miguel de Silva, who had eagerly solicited the post; he had little idea, however, of the Emperor's mood.¹

The strict neutrality to which the Pope saw himself driven in consequence of the French King's threats of apostasy² was unbearable to Charles V. Since Francis I., who was in alliance with the Turk, had been the aggressor, he was convinced that it was the Pope's duty to declare himself against him. In Paul III.'s rôle of mediator he saw the action of a partisan of his enemy. He was deeply wounded that the Bull of the Council in its exhortations to peace should speak of him, the champion of Christendom, in exactly the same tone in which it spoke of Francis, his deadly enemy, and in his estimation the sole destroyer of peace.

At first Charles fought against his agitation, so that it might not seem as if he wished to hinder the Council, and also advised his brother to take no offence at the phraseology of the Bull.³ But when the French declaration of war arrived soon after, his long-suppressed indignation at the Papal neutrality found vent with extreme violence. In his detailed reply to the Bull, dated from Monzon the 25th of August 1542, Charles bitterly complained that he was placed by the Pope on a level with Francis I. He had always been an obedient son to the Father of Christendom; at incalculable cost, at the peril indeed of life itself, he had fought the Turks by sea and land; he had used every resource to suppress heresy in Germany, while the boundless

¹ Cf. L. Tolomei's *report of Aug. 26, 1542 (State Archives, Siena), and that of N. Sernini of the same date in Appendix No. 18 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The brief of credence for Sylva in LANZ, II., 357 *seq.*; in GAYANGOS, VI., 2, n. 50, incorrectly dated.

² Cf. Serristori's *report of Aug. 4, 1542 (State Archives, Florence).

³ See the letter of Aug. 11, 1542, in KORTE, 59, 83.

ambition of Francis I. had turned the sword of the infidel against the Christian, stiffened the obstinacy of the Protestants, put difficulties in the way of the Council and even now, under the flimsiest pretexts, had broken up the armistice concluded through Papal mediation. The ample statement of all his disputes with the French King had been interspersed by the Emperor with numerous hits at the Pope. At the very beginning, he says, Paul III. might take as an example the father in the Gospel, who indeed welcomes back the lost son, but still does not set him above the industrious and obedient one. Then follows the complaint, which he, the Emperor, cannot refrain from uttering, that the whole College of Cardinals is subservient to the will of Francis I. in order to purchase an ostentatious profession of faith. In conclusion, Charles V. observes without disguise that if the Pope rightly understood his duty he would make cause against Francis without reserve; in this way alone can the Council be held and a possible remedy for the scandals of Christendom be found; whether under other conditions the Council can be attended by the Estates of the Empire and the bishops of the Imperial States is a question which the Pope in his own wisdom must answer.¹

On the 18th of September the Imperial ambassador handed this embittered letter of his master to the Pope, then in sojourn in Perugia; the ambassador took the opportunity of again asking the Pope to take sides decisively against Francis I. But Paul III. still adhered now to what in former years he had once said to Granvelle, the Chancellor of Charles V.: "Neutrality in Rome, like our daily bread, must be regarded as a necessity."² This view was shared by the

¹ In the Latin text in EHSSES, IV., 238-245; *cf.* also PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 1, n. 1, 2; KORTE, 58 *seqq.*

² EHSSES, IV., 245, n. 1.

Cardinals, with the exception, naturally, of the adherents of Francis I. and Charles V. Among the latter, Cardinal Dionisio Laurerio went so far as to demand that Francis should be deprived of the title of Most Christian King and that excommunication and war should be declared against him.¹

What specially withheld the Pope from taking extreme measures against Francis I. was the total miscarriage of the ecclesiastical penalties passed on Henry VIII. To attempt now similar proceedings against the French King would, it appeared to him, be a downright act of folly, as he would thereby not only sever a member from the Christian body, but split Christendom itself into two portions.² With regard to the Emperor's letter, Farnese told the nuncio Poggio on the 19th of September 1542 that an answer would be sent after the Pope's return to Rome ; at the same time, for the information of the nuncio, certain objections made by Charles to the composition of the Bull were refuted.³

In the meantime the more immediate preparations for the Council had begun. On the 2nd of June, in express anticipation of the coming Synod, the College of Cardinals was increased by seven new members, among whom was Morone.⁴ In August a prelate and some other officials were sent to Trent,⁵ and on the 18th of September the Pope appointed Bishops Gian Matteo Giberti of Verona and Gian Tommaso Sanfelice of Cava as commissaries to

¹ For the discussions then held, see JOVIUS, Hist., l. 42.

² Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 2, n. 1.

³ EHSES, IV., 247.

⁴ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 1, n. 7 ; Farnese to Poggio, dat. June 4, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 231 *seq.*), and Vol. XI. of this work, p. 203 *seqq.*

⁵ Farnese to the Cardinal of Trent, dat. Aug. 19, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 238). In the consistory of August the 11th the speech "De mittendis clericis ceremoniarum et foreriis ad locum concilii" (*ibid.*, n. 4).

superintend the further preparations.¹ Of these two the latter only, who left on the 23rd of September² and reached Trent on the 5th of October,³ was in a position to meet the requirements of his task. That he did this actively and prudently his despatches to Farnese show. In consultation with the Bishop of Trent preparations, carefully considered and arranged, were made for the lodgment of the Cardinals, bishops, envoys, and their suites, for a regular postal service, for the internal and external security of the city, for the security of the streets, and for the provisioning and commissariat.⁴ Sanfelice, to his great dissatisfaction, had besides to encounter the doubts of the citizens of Trent whether the Curia was really in earnest about holding the Council, since up to the 25th of October not a word had been heard of the nomination of the conciliar Legates.⁵

¹ The brief in EHSES, IV., 246.

² Farnese to Sadoletto, dat. Sept. 25, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 246, n. 1); *cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 4, n. 1. On the 18th Sept. Orlando Ricci was also sent as a commissary to Trent to assist the Bishops of Cava and Trent in the preliminary labours. See his brief in EHSES, IV., 246.

³ His report to Farnese of Oct. 6, 1542, in EHSES, IV., 251.

⁴ See the reports of the Bishop of Cava to Farnese of Oct. 6, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 251 *seq.*), Oct. 9 (*ibid.*, 252-254), Oct. 13 (*ibid.*, 254-259, with the supplement "Consultatio," dat. 13 Octobris 1542), Oct. 19 (*ibid.*, 264-266), Oct. 25 (*ibid.*, 266 *seq.*), Nov. 4 (*ibid.*, 278 *seq.*), Nov. 10 (*ibid.*, 280), Nov. 15 (*ibid.*, 284), Nov. 30 (*ibid.*, 290), Dec. 6 and 9 (*ibid.*, 291), Dec. 15 and 22 (*ibid.*, 293); also Farnese's answers of Oct. 20 (*ibid.*, 266), Oct. 28 (*ibid.*, 275) Nov. 1 (*ibid.*, 276), and Farnese's letter to the conciliar Legates of Dec. 2 (*ibid.*, 290). *Cf.* KORTE, 62 *seq.*, who expresses the view that "notwithstanding all these preparations it may well be doubted whether the Curia really thought seriously of holding the Council."

⁵ *Cf.* his letter to Farnese of Oct. 25 begging the Cardinal to forward him frequent instructions concerning the Council so that he may have his letters to appeal to in order to silence doubts. Farnese, in his reply on Nov. 1, assured him of the Pope's firm determination.

On the 16th of October 1542 the Pope nominated, after prolonged consultation, the three conciliar Legates.¹ They were Cardinals of distinction: Parisio, Morone, and Pole.² Three days later they received the Legatine cross.³ Their instructions were, at the command of Paul III., drawn up by the Cardinals Giovanni Maria del Monte, Bartolommeo Guidiccioni, and the Bishop of Feltre, Tommaso Campeggio; they bear the date the 26th of October, 1542.⁴ Pole left Rome for Trent on the 26th of October, and Morone and Parisio on the 27th and 28th.⁵ The delay in their journey was apologized for by Farnese in a letter of October 28th to the Bishop of Cava⁶ in which the latter and the Bishop of Trent were commissioned to receive the prelates on their arrival until the coming of the Legates. On the 30th of October the Pope renewed the decree of the 29th of May 1536 on the Papal election in case such an emergency should arise during the Council.⁷

Sanfelice thanked him on Nov. 10 for this letter, which enabled him to meet the doubters with greater confidence.

¹ Cf. N. Sernini's *report of Oct. 14, 1542, in Appendix No. 19 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² See *report of N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, Oct. 17, 1542 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The Bull of appointment of the same day in EHSES, IV, 261 *seq.*

³ Farnese to Sanfelice, dat. Oct. 20, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 266); Farnese to Poggio, dat. Nov. 3, 1542; EHSES (IV., 277) gives the date as Oct. 20; also PALLAVICINI (l. 5, c. 4, n. 1).

⁴ In EHSES, IV., 267-275. For Guidiccioni's memorial and his previous labours in other ways on behalf of the Council on which the memorial is based, cf. SCHWEITZER, Guidiccioni, 190-194.

⁵ Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 418; cf. EHSES, IV., 261, n. 2.

⁶ EHSES, IV., 275 *seq.*

⁷ *Report of N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, Nov. 2, 1542 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); EHSES, IV., 268, n. 1; PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 1, n. 8.

Immediately after the appointment of the Legates the remaining requisite steps for the approaching opening of the Council were taken. In briefs of October the 16th those foreign Bishops whose previous summonses to Rome in view of the Council had not been followed by any result, were again urgently addressed by the Pope.¹ On November the 3rd Farnese directed the nuncio Poggio² to intimate to the Emperor the nomination and departure of the Legates, and to beg him to send the prelates of his States to the Council. The invitation to the Spanish Bishops was entrusted to the Portuguese Cardinal de Silva of Viseu, who had succeeded Contarini, on the death of the latter, as Legate to the Emperor.³ Sadoletto, who had been sent in the interests of peace as Legate to France, tried to get Francis to look favourably on the Council; he was unable, however, to move the King from his stiff attitude of refusal. His interposition on behalf of peace was equally unsuccessful.⁴

Cardinal de Silva fared still worse. In disgrace with his own King, he received from the Emperor, who had come to terms of friendship with the Portuguese monarch, the worst reception. The mission of the Legate was still more objectionable than his person, and he determined simply to dismiss him; on the 8th of October he communicated to the Pope his intention. The letter is full of dry remarks on the Pope's mediation for peace which had only made Francis I. more daring; as his Holiness was the originator of the armistice, it was his duty to avenge its violation; the longer sojourn of the Legate was purposeless, negotiations with him were superfluous, as

¹ The brief to the Cardinal of Lorraine in EHSES, IV., 262; *cf.* also *ibid.*, 277, n. 4.

² *Ibid.*, 276 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 283, n. 2.

⁴ See PIEPER, 124; EHSES, IV., 283.

they only afforded the French King fresh opportunities of exercising deception.¹

After this very clear declaration no other course remained to the Pope but to recall the Legate; which he did on the 2nd of November. The Pope now resolved to try once more the experiment which had been successful in 1538. After long discussion in consistory² it was decided on the 10th of November to address an almost identically expressed brief to both sovereigns with the proposal that, for the sake of negotiations on the subject of the peace which the Turkish danger made so necessary, they should meet the Pope personally in Lombardy. The Pope, in making this proposal, dwelt on the great duty which his office imposed upon him of never failing to exercise the authority of the father as well as of the judge.³

The date fixed for the opening of the Council had in the meantime been exceeded by three weeks when the Legates made their solemn entry into Trent.⁴ This proceeding seems at first to have evoked favourable and hopeful impressions. Hitherto, as Robert Wauchope had found in September, public opinion in Germany had been tepid and inactive,⁵

¹ LANZ, II., 378 (with wrong date); *cf.* GAYANGOS, VI., 2, n. 65; EHSES, IV., 264, n. 1, 283, n. 1.

² See Acta Consist. in EHSES, IV., 247, n. 1, 287, n. 5, and *report of N. Sernini to Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Rome, Nov. 7, 1542, dealing specially with the Turkish war. The latter was also discussed in consistory on Nov. 24 (see *report of N. Sernini of Nov. 25, 1542, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See *Acta Consist. for Nov. 10, 1542 (Consistorial Archives, Vatican); *cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1542, n. 31 *seq.*; EHSES, IV., 287, n. 5.

⁴ The Bishop of Cava to Farnese, dat. Nov. 23, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 285). The three Legates to Farnese, Nov. 24, 1542 (*ibid.*, 286 *seq.*). PALLAVICINI (l. 5, c. 4, n. 1) gives Nov. 22 as the day of their arrival in Trent.

⁵ Wauchope to Cardinal Cervini from Salzburg, dat. Oct. 1, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 250).

those who were well disposed towards the Council were shy of expressing themselves, while those who declared themselves ready to attend the Council in person were determined to wait until the Pope had begun his journey to Trent; among these were the Bishop of Ratisbon and the Archbishop of Salzburg, who promised that he would then appear with his provincial bishops. On the 13th of November came the Cathedral Dean of Salzburg, Ambrosius von Lamberg, to inform himself of the position of things in Trent.¹

The three Legates, on their arrival in Trent, sent to Farnese² a list, which has not been preserved, of the German bishops who sent envoys to the Council with the promise to attend themselves or by representatives; they thought that they had grounds for hoping that now that their coming was an established fact that an increasingly great number would attend. Less optimistic was Gian Tommaso Sanfelice, Bishop of Cava, who wrote to Farnese³ on the 30th of November: “As yet no one has come; we must at least, this once, take care that Italian prelates appear, especially such as belong to the Curia.” In Sanfelice’s letters of December the 6th and 9th⁴ the same view is expressed concerning the participation of the German bishops, and he calls attention to the fact that the forthcoming Diet at Nuremberg would decide whether the Germans generally would attend the Council or not. On December the 17th Sanfelice urged again⁵ that the Italian bishops must put in an appearance first. The Archbishop of Salzburg certainly wrote a letter on the 28th of

¹ Sanfelice to Farnese, dat. Nov. 15, 1542 (EHSES, IV., 284).

² Nov. 24, 1542 (*ibid.*, 287).

³ *Ibid.*, 290.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 293.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 291.

November to Morone¹ in which he declared that, since he had been informed of the Legates' arrival, he was now ready, together with his provincial bishops, to come to Trent as soon as he heard that the Council would pursue its course. He also instructed the Dean of his Chapter to tell Morone, on the delivery of his letter,² that he would appear in person with eight of his suffragans within eight days if he heard that as many prelates from Italy and other countries had arrived as would secure the constitution of the Council. The Dean thought, moreover, that all the other German prelates would follow as soon as the participation of the other nations became known and the certainty of a General Council thus secured; he also declared that it was taken for certain in Germany that King Ferdinand would go to Trent at the close of the Diet. On the 14th of December came from Ferdinand himself the message to the Bishop of Trent³ bidding him express to the Legates the King's delight at the beginning of the Council and to keep in view the early arrival of his envoy; his own absence he excused on account of the Diet, but intended when that was over to go to Innsbruck in order to be able, in case of necessity, to reach Trent without difficulty.

Charles V. had nominated, on the 18th of October, the Chancellor Granvelle, his son Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, the Marquis de Aguilar, and his ambassador at Venice, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, to be his orators at the Council.⁴ Granvelle, however, did not

¹ EHSES, IV., 287 *seq.*

² The Legates to Farnese, Dec. 11-15, 1542 (*ibid.*, 292).

³ *Cf.* the letters of the Bishop of Cava of Dec. 15, and of the Legates of 22nd, 1542, to Farnese, in EHSES, IV., 293, and n. 3.

⁴ Mandatum Caroli V., dat. Barcinone, 18 Octobris 1542 (EHSES, IV., 263 *seq.*). For their entrance into Trent, *cf. ibid.*, 297, 298; PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 4, n. 1-19; KORTE, 64-68.

leave Spain before December. On his arrival in Italy he not only avoided paying a previous visit to the Pope, but his intention of going to Trent was also carefully kept a secret from Paul III. when Granvelle's younger son Thomas de Chantonnay and the Imperial ambassador Aguilar had an audience of him on December the 24th. For the sake of complete secrecy it was also arranged that Aguilar should remain in Rome and not take a part in the embassy.¹

The Florentine secretary Lorenzo Pagni, who accompanied Granvelle into Italy, was certainly of opinion, as he reported to his sovereign the Duke from Piacenza on the 28th of December,² that the Imperial Chancellor was going to Trent with the intention of bringing about an adjournment of the Council. In any case, the Imperial diplomacy was directed towards leaving the Pope and the conciliar Legates entirely in the dark as to the intended mission and its object; the latter were to be entirely unprepared and taken by surprise, a manœuvre which in the event proved completely successful.

The arrival of Granvelle and his companions at Trent took place on the 7th or 8th of January 1543.³ They at once visited the Legates. During the proceedings on the following day⁴ Granvelle requested a public audience for the orators in the Cathedral in which they could tender excuses for the Emperor's absence and the delay in the despatch of his orators, then publicly notify their appearance and receive an official acknowledgment that this

¹ Cf. EHSES, IV., 297, n. 1.

² *Ibid.*

³ EHSES (IV., 297 n. 2) takes Jan. 7 as the correct date of arrival, although the reports say Jan. 8.

⁴ See the Legates' report to Farnese of Jan. 9, 1543, in EHSES, IV., 297-300.

had taken place. The Legates did not comply with this demand; the precedents of former Councils must not be departed from, for before the Council had been solemnly opened, after previous fasting and prayer, it did not appear to be becoming to proceed to any public act; the presentation of the mandates had always taken place after the inauguration in the congregations. But if they wished a certificate from the Legates of their appearance and the presentation of the mandates, they were ready to give them one. Granvelle replied with warmth that the refusal of a public audience was an affront to the Emperor; he threatened, if the Legates persisted therein, to put forward a plea of nullity against the Council and to have the same affixed to the doors of the Cathedral. The Legates stood firm; it was not in their power to grant an audience in the Cathedral; an understanding, however, was arrived at by an assurance that the orators should be heard in the house of Cardinal Parisio. Here they appeared with a retinue on the 9th of January.¹

The Bishop of Arras made a speech in which he first spoke of the necessity of a Council and of the Emperor's persistent zeal in its behalf, now once more manifested in the despatch of his orators, whose presence in his name would be an effectual help to the carrying out of the Council. If Charles V. was unable to be present himself, he had an adequate excuse in the preoccupations of war which prevented him leaving his dominions; their own late arrival also was caused by the danger and insecurity of the journey and the existing condition of affairs; the bishops in the same way had been hindered

¹ See the notarial documents: "Comparitio oratorium Caroli V Imperatoris coram legatis Apostolicis. Oratio habita ab Antonio Perenoto, episcopo Atrebatensi. Tridenti 9 Januarii 1543" (EHSSES, IV., 300-303).

from coming up to the present time by this very insecurity ; they promised, however, in the Emperor's name, that he would himself appear later, unless he was hindered, contrary to his wishes, in the case of his presence being of use to the Council, and that he would send his bishops as soon as they could undertake the journey. They were now here themselves with full powers to assist the Council in every way. After this discourse the Emperor's mandate was read out and then, at Granvelle's request, a notarial deed was drawn up registering the whole proceeding. At the close of this public transaction the orators again assured the Legates, but not in the presence of witnesses, of their best wishes, but on the following day, January the 10th, Granvelle informed the Legates individually that he was obliged to return to Nuremberg to the Diet.¹ Accordingly, on January the 11th he left Trent, together with his son.

The whole manner of his arrival, combined with his departure for Germany, filled the Legates with justifiable suspicion. They surmised² that Granvelle had come to Trent only in order to ascertain that the Council had not yet begun ; they were also in anxiety lest the Imperial diplomacy, as soon as the eighteen months fixed by the Recess of Ratisbon had expired, should pursue the object, at the Diet of Nuremberg, either of deciding on a national council or of yielding to the demands of the Protestants in order to secure their aid against the Turks. To meet this danger it was represented to the Pope by the Legates that he ought not now to delay in inducing the bishops to betake

¹ "Sommario del ragionamento havuto da Monsgr. di Granvella col. card. Morono alli 10 da gennario 1543 in Trento" (EHSES, IV., 304 *seq.*). "Ex ejusdem Granvellaee colloquiis cum Parisio et Polo cardinalibus habitis Tridenti 10 Januarii 1543" (*ibid.*, 305 *seq.*).

² The Legates to Farnese, dat. 1543, Jan. 12 (*ibid.*, 306-308 ; *cf.* 297, n. 1).

themselves to Trent to enable the Council to be held; he ought also to send someone from Rome to Nuremberg to make, simultaneously with the nuncio Verallo, the necessary representations to King Ferdinand and Granvelle, in order to turn them from their ruinous schemes, since the whole question of religion and reformation must be reserved to the Council. Notwithstanding the promises and the decisive protests made by the Legates, Mendoza, who had remained behind temporarily in Trent, also returned on January the 17th to his post as ambassador to Venice.¹

Orders were at once given from Rome corresponding to the Legates' admonitions. In his answer to the letter of the 9th of January 1543 Farnese had informed them on the 20th² that the Pope had given orders that steps should be taken to secure the presence at Trent of an appreciable number of Italian bishops. Cardinal Cervini was commissioned on January the 19th,³ and again, on the receipt of the fuller reports, on the 22nd,⁴ to inform the Italian bishops appointed for that purpose that they must hold themselves in readiness for their journey. On the 29th of January the Pope, in addition to his preparations for the journey to Bologna, had been specially occupied with urgent reminders to the Italian and other bishops of their journey to Trent. To a great number of prelates present in Rome, wrote Farnese on the 14th of February to the nuncio Poggio,⁵ the orders for departure have been sent, while others are every day holding themselves in readiness to start.

Corresponding measures were taken with regard to the remaining bishops in and out of Italy. The nuncio Poggio

¹ The Legates to Farnese, dat. Jan. 17, 1543 (*ibid.*, 308).

² *Ibid.*, 300, n. 1.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, 309, n. 2.

⁴ Farnese to Cervini, dat. Jan. 22, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 308 *seq.*).

⁵ *Ibid.*, 309-311.

was at the same time instructed to urge upon the Emperor to send without delay the bishops of all his territories and to exhort the King of Portugal to do the same.¹ To King Sigismund I. of Poland, on the 18th of February, a brief² was sent. The Pope thanked him for his reply, sent by Otto von Truchsess, and prayed him to send off his orators and the prelates of his kingdom. On February the 25th orders were sent to the Sardinian metropolitans and their suffragans to repair with the abbots and other prelates of their dioceses to the Council without delay; similar instructions were sent to many other prelates as, on the 5th of March, to the Bishops of Sitten and Chur and the Abbots of St. Gall and St. Urban.³

To the Diet at Nuremberg Otto von Truchsess was sent as in former years. He brought with him a brief addressed to King Ferdinand and the archbishops, bishops, and princes⁴ assembled in the Diet, drawn up on the 18th of February 1543, complaining of the neglect of the invitation to the Council shown by the bishops of Germany up to that time. The object of Otto's mission was described to be the enforcement of this invitation with the co-operation of Verallo.⁵ Truchsess left Rome on the 26th of February;⁶ in accordance with his instructions,⁷ he was first to visit Trent to transmit orders to the Legates and to receive from them advice regarding his mission to

¹ On March 13 and again on April 6 Poggio was again commissioned to urge the appearance of the Spanish prelates (*ibid.*, 316).

² *Ibid.*, 312, 316, n. 4.

³ *Ibid.*, 314, n. 7, 315.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 311 *seq.*

⁵ *Cf. ibid.*, 312; *ibid.*, 313 *seq.*, a letter of an unidentified correspondent to Granvelle of Feb. 21, 1543, in which the latter is begged to prevent resolutions in the Diet which might put hindrances in the way of the Council.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 311, n. 3.

⁷ Dat. Spoleto, March 4 (*ibid.*, 315).

Germany. On his arrival in Nuremberg he was, if King Ferdinand, Granvelle, and the nuncio were there, to seek out the latter first and go with him to the King to lay before him the object of his mission and convey to him information about the Pope's journey to Bologna; his instructions for Granvelle were similar. If, however, Ferdinand and the nuncio had already started for Bohemia, he was to give his information to Granvelle and then follow up the King and Verallo, returning to the Diet from there, if the nuncio thought good, on the accomplishment of his instructions. Truchsess reached Trent on March the 12th and continued his journey on the 15th, after transacting his business with the Legates.¹ They gave him, further, a letter for Verallo² which, while referring him for the most part to Truchsess's verbal communications, contained special injunctions to do everything in combination with him that could check dangerous resolutions in the Diet.

Truchsess who, on his onward journey from Augsburg had transacted business with Duke William of Bavaria and received in Eichstätt the solemn promise of Bishop Moritz von Hutten to attend the Council at Trent, reached Nuremberg on the 22nd of March.³ In accordance with his instructions he had an interview with King Ferdinand on Holy Saturday, in the presence of the nuncio; the King gave him benevolent assurances of the presence of the German bishops at the Council. He then saw Granvelle, who complained with emotion of the distrust felt towards him in Rome, but finally also promised his assistance in the matter of the Council. On March

¹ The Legates to Farnese, dat. March 15, 1543 (*ibid.*, 317 *seq.*).

² Dat. March 14, 1543 (*ibid.*, 316 *seq.*).

³ Truchsess to Farnese from Nuremberg, dat. March 31, 1543 (*ibid.*, 319 *seq.*).

the 26th Truchsess went to see the Bishop of Augsburg, Christoph von Stadion, who enlarged on the necessity for the Council and the dangerous condition of Germany, and likewise declared his readiness to give support.¹ On April the 6th Truchsess reported again² that he had sent the briefs addressed to princes who were absent from Nuremberg through their envoys; the archbishops he intended to visit personally. Truchsess at this time was full of hope for his mission and that after the Diet was over the Catholics would go to Trent without delay, as so many had already determined to do: thus the Cardinal of Mayence had already given orders to that effect to the Bishop of Hildesheim, to his own coadjutor, and to two theologians.³

On the whole, however, the Catholics confined themselves to fine words and empty promises, since King Ferdinand, notwithstanding his ostensible goodwill, was implicated in his brother's policy. The Bishop of Vienna, Nausea, whose enthusiasm for the Council had led him repeatedly to ask the Pope to call him to his side, since it was in his power to give him important information, could only on receipt of the brief of February the 18th send a letter of excuse to Paul III.⁴ to say that on account of express

¹ The full account in his letter above mentioned of March 31 (*ibid.*, 320-325).

² *Ibid.*, 325, n. 6.

³ Further reports from Truchsess, who soon afterwards, on the death of Christoph von Stadion (April 15), was chosen Bishop of Augsburg on May 10, do not appear to be forthcoming (EHSES, IV., 326, n.). The Bishop of Hildesheim, Valentine von Teutleben, came to Trent after the Diet, but not with the Archbishop of Mayence, but with his suffragan (see *infra*, p. 167).

⁴ Dat. Vienna, April 25, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 326 *seq.*). For his subsequent summons to the Pope and his journey to the latter at Parma, see *infra*, p. 174.

counter-orders from the King he was obliged to abandon his departure for Trent; his immediate journey must be put off, but he hoped as soon as possible to attend the Council and to pay a visit beforehand to the Pope. On the other hand, the apprehensions aroused by the Diet in the Catholic party were not fulfilled. The Protestants certainly, as Verallo wrote to Farnese on the 12th of April,¹ were not backward in trying, if possible, to bring Charles to summon a national council; but no conclusion was reached on the further treatment of the religious question, nor was the question itself discussed in the Diet. Granvelle on his return to Trent from Nuremberg took to himself the credit for this.² The Protestants on this occasion had to be content with another protest against the Council.³ The danger of a national council was not removed in this way; it was only pushed somewhat into the background.

One by one and at long intervals a few bishops arrived at Trent; they were Italians, for the most part, attached to the Curia, and a few Germans. On Granvelle's first arrival in Trent, besides the Bishop of Cava, Bishop Richard Pate of Worcester had already arrived and was a witness of the proceedings on the 9th of January.⁴ On March the 10th came Tommaso Campeggio, Bishop of Feltre,⁵ and on the 11th Cornelio Mussi, Bishop of Bertinoro;

¹ EHSES, IV., 317, n. 1.

² Cf. Morone's report to Farnese of May 26, 1543 (*ibid.*, 335 *seq.*).

³ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 4, n. 17; EHSES, IV., 336, n. 2.

⁴ EHSES, IV., 303.

⁵ T. Campeggio to Farnese, dat. March 15, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 318); the Legates to Farnese, dat. March 15, 1543 (*ibid.*); the Legates to the nuncio Verallo, dat. March 14, 1543 (*ibid.*, 316). Campeggio immediately on his arrival had been struck by the unsuitableness of Trent for the Council on account of the scarcity of accommodation and lack of means for keeping up its provisionment. In his letter of March 15 he gave his opinion that the Council ought only to be

on the 20th of March they were followed by the Archbishop of Corfù, Giacomo Cauco, and Bishop Giacomo Giacomello of Belcastro.¹ On the 28th of March the procurators of three German prelates presented their mandates,² and on April the 4th the Legates³ mentioned the presence of the Archbishop of Otranto, Pietro Antonio da Capua. The good feeling and zeal of the prelates who up to April 15th had appeared on the scene is praised in a letter of the Bishop of Trent to Farnese on the 30th of April⁴ from Brixen, the former having come to that city a fortnight before. About this time also the Bishop of Chironia (Cheronæa), Dionigi Zannettini, was at Trent.⁵ On the 10th of May arrived the Bishop of Hildesheim, Valentine von Teutleben, and his coadjutor Balthasar Waneman; the two bishops, who were accompanied by the jurist Dr. Conrad Braun, came together in the name of the Cardinal of Mayence.⁶ The Bishop of Hildesheim made special excuses in a letter to the Pope for the absence of Albert,⁷ laid stress on the necessity for a Council, and made strong representations that everything should be done to avert the threatened national council and to obtain from the Emperor in the meantime the revocation and cancellation of that consent to the Recess of Ratisbon

opened formally and then without delay transferred elsewhere or, better still, not be opened at all but at once relegated to some other locality. The Legates also on March 28 called attention to the inconveniences of provisionment: to Farnese (*ibid.*, 319).

¹ The Legates on March 20 to Farnese (*ibid.*).

² The same on March 29 to same (*ibid.*).

³ To Farnese (*ibid.*, 328, n. 3).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 327 *seq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 328, n. 6.

⁶ Parisio and Morone to Farnese (*ibid.*, 329).

⁷ Cf. the letter to Farnese of May 20, 1543 (*ibid.*, 330 *seq.*). Ehses could not find the letter of May 16 to the Pope himself.

which the Protestants had wrung from him under pressure. The Bishop of Würzburg, Conrad von Bibra, since he could not attend in person, appointed on the 1st of June as his representatives the Bishops of Eichstätt and Hildesheim.¹ The former of the two, Moritz von Hutten, came to Trent at the end of June and went thence to visit the Pope at Bologna.² The hope that after the close of the Diet a still greater number of German bishops would arrive proved deceptive. In consonance with the policy of Charles V., the Spanish bishops who appeared were as few in number³ as the French, the latter being forbidden to travel by Francis I.⁴ The further time advanced the more nugatory seemed the prospect of the opening of the Council.

¹ His letter to the Pope of June 1, 1543 (*ibid.*, 342).

² Morone to Farnese, dat. June 30, 1543 (*ibid.*, 346; *cf.* 342, n. 4). In the beginning of July representatives of the Elector of Treves came to Trent (*ibid.*, 352, n. 3).

³ Some Spanish Bishops came to Italy in the Emperor's suite on his visit to the Pope, but not before (see *infra*, p. 180).

⁴ On Feb. 20 or 21 the ambassador of Francis I., de Siney, came to Rome. He brought with him the King's refusal to take part in the proposed meeting, and at the same time informed the Pope that neither the French King nor his prelates would appear at the Council (EHSES, IV., 310, n. 1, 314; *cf.* also 337 *seq.*, n. 5).

CHAPTER IV.

THE MEETING BETWEEN PAUL III. AND CHARLES V. AT BUSSETO.—SUSPENSION OF THE COUNCIL.—THE POPE'S NEUTRALITY AND EXERTIONS FOR PEACE.—MISUNDERSTANDINGS WITH THE EMPEROR.

PAUL III. had left Rome on the 26th of February 1543 for Bologna, partly on account of his endeavours to secure peace and partly that he might be nearer to Trent. His journey was opposed by many in Rome, where the worst reports were in circulation¹ as to the Emperor's intentions. Nevertheless, the Pope set out; he did not listen to the complaints of the Romans, the representations of the Cardinals, and the prayers of his relations, who brought before the aged man the dangers of a journey at such an unfavourable season of the year. Cardinal Carpi again remained behind as Legate. To the General of the troops, Alessandro Vitelli, was committed the safe custody of the castle of St. Angelo.² Paul III. entered Bologna on the 17th of March;³ in order to personally acquaint himself

¹ See the letter to Granvelle of Feb. 21, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 313).

² See JOVIUS, Hist., I., 43, and EHSES, IV., 316, n. 7.

³ See Gualterius, *Diarium (Secret Archives of the Vatican, Miscell. Arm., 12, t. 58, f. 368^b). According to this source the Pope left Bologna on April 2 for Modena, from thence to Parma (April 5 and 6); on 8th he reached Piacenza, returned to Parma on the 15th, remained there until 19th, and then went to Ferrara, where he made his state entry on April 22. (For his stay there and the objects thereby obtained, see FONTANA, II., 177 *seq.*, and RODOCANACHI, Renée de France, 160

with the state of things in Trent and to be better informed as to the views of the Legates, he summoned Cardinal Pole to him on the 3rd of May.¹ Pole started on the 5th.² A discussion was held in consistory on the 11th of May whether, under existing circumstances, affairs at Trent should be allowed to drift or the Council be postponed to a more favourable time. The prevailing view among the Cardinals was that the Pope's efforts hitherto had been more than sufficient to prove his zeal. If the experiment of the Council were persisted in much longer, the only result would be to make the disobedience of the Catholics appear all the more culpable and inconsiderate and increasingly to diminish the respect for Papal authority among the party of error. It would therefore be the lesser evil to dissolve the assembly now with a promise of resumption at a time when the members of the Christian body seemed better disposed thereto.³ The Pope, however, was unwilling to make a decision until he had personally conferred with the Emperor, who on May the 1st had embarked at Barcelona for Italy. On the 13th or 14th of May, Parisio was also summoned to Bologna.⁴ In Trent the sudden departure of the two Legates, the object of

seqq.) On April 25 the Pope returned to Bologna, whither on April 27 Capodiferro came from France; on May 12 Dandino was despatched to France (*cf.* PIEPER, 126).

¹ Farnese to Pole from Bologna, dat. May 3, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 328).

² Parisio and Morone to Farnese, dat. May 6, 1543 (*ibid.*, 329).

³ Thus PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 4, n. 19, who is mistaken, however, in stating that Parisio had already been summoned to Bologna before Pole. The extract from the Consistorial Acta of May 11 in EHSES (IV., 329, n. 2) gives only the names of the eight Cardinals named deputies in the affair of the Council in this consistory.

⁴ Parisio and Morone to Farnese, dat. May 16, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 330; *cf.* n. 1 for the date).

which was a matter of mere surmise, produced a dispiriting impression. The assembled prelates felt that their last hope of meeting in Council had slipped from them.¹

On the 26th of May Granvelle, with the Bishop of Arras and his two other sons, arrived at Trent on his return from Nuremberg.² In discussing the question of the Council with Morone, who was the only Legate left in Trent, he regretted that the two others had been called away, since when this became known in Germany the Council would be regarded with general incredulity, the Protestants would become bolder than ever, and the Catholics correspondingly depressed. If it were the Pope's intention to dissolve the Council, then it would be fitting that he should first consult the Emperor and the King and even himself as to the manner and way of doing so. Morone replied that he was not aware that Paul III. had summoned to him his colleagues for the purpose of dissolving the Council. He thought it much more likely that he wished to take their advice as to what ought to be the next matter for negotiation with the Emperor. For the rest, no decision had been taken whether the Council was to go on or be suspended; if the Pope had already resolved on the latter course, he would not have allowed Morone himself and the other prelates to remain longer in Trent. He was also certain that the two Legates would return. If the Emperor came to Italy and had a meeting with Paul III., it would only be reasonable that the question of the Council should be dealt with

¹ Cf. letter from Tommaso Campeggio to Cardinal Cervini of May 21, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 331 *seqq.*). The two Hildesheimer bishops repeated to Campeggio their expressions of anxiety lest the failure to hold the General Council would be followed, in accordance with the Recess of Ratisbon, by a national council (EHSES, IV., 332 *seq.*).

² See Morone's full reports to Farnese on May 26 and 28, 1543, of his negotiations with Granvelle (EHSES, IV., 335-342). Cf. KORTE, 68 *seq.*

and settled between them ; but it was no matter of surprise if the Pope wished also to confer with two of his Legates beforehand. As his own opinion, which, as he observed, he had not imparted to the Emperor or the King, Granvelle gave it to be understood that the Council ought not now to be actually opened and held, or dissolved, but allowed to remain in its present unsettled condition ; so that an Imperial army in Germany might find in it precisely the kind of weapon with which to curb the Lutherans, while on the other side it would bring moral support to the Catholics and the wavering.¹

Charles V. had landed at Savona on May the 24th and then gone on to Genoa,² where he found Pier Luigi Farnese sent by the Pope to invite him to a conference at Bologna. The Emperor, who was little inclined for peace negotiations for their own sake and was in haste to reach Germany, declined the invitation, but on the other hand showed himself willing to meet the Pope at some spot convenient to himself, such as Parma or Mantua.³ Charles V. adhered to this even when Cardinal Farnese proposed a town not far from Bologna ; he could not go so far out of his route. It was believed by many that the Emperor, out of consideration for Henry VIII., with whom to the general astonishment he had concluded on February the 11th, 1543, an offensive alliance against Francis I., wished to create the appearance of being forced reluctantly into a meeting with the Pope.⁴

¹ EHSES, IV., 337-341.

² On this journey Charles V. dictated the famous instructions for his son (see GACHARD, *Biogr. nat.*, III., 666).

³ GAYANGOS, VI., 2, n. 153.

⁴ JOVIUS, *Hist.*, I., 43, confirmed by GAYANGOS, VI., 2, p. 400 *seq.* ; for the alliance with Henry VIII., which was at first to be kept secret, see *State Papers*, IX., 355, n. 2 ; RYMER, XIV., 768 *seq.* ; EHSES, IV., 338, n. 1 ; BROSCHE, VI., 359 *seq.* ; GACHARD, *loc. cit.*, 663.

Farnese arrived at Bologna with the Emperor's answer on June the 8th, just in time to take part in the consistory held on that day. The views of the Cardinals were divided; not a few were of opinion that the aged Pope should not risk his health by any greater excitement nor expose the majesty of his office to any further humiliation. Sadoletto, however, interposed in a contrary sense; as regarded the question of health he imparted their decision, as a matter of course, privately to the Pope; as far as the Papal office was concerned none other existed—for the servants of the Church—to the care of which the salvation of Christendom could be committed. Nor could there be any doubt that the conclusion of peace might be awaited with greater certainty if the Pope appeared personally as a mediator. Besides, the contemplated meeting would also be of service in dissipating the rumours of a serious quarrel between the two sovereign heads of Christendom. The Pope yielded to this advice, and the consistory agreed unanimously that the conference should be held at Parma or in some other conveniently situated place.¹

The Pope accordingly left Bologna on June the 11th and reached Parma on the 15th,² where he found the Marquis del Vasto with an autograph letter from Charles. Great difficulties were caused at the last moment by the Emperor's intention of appearing with a large military force. The Papal party remembered then full well the claims of the Emperor on Parma, raised in his letter of complaint to Clement VII. In order to obviate all grounds of danger, it was agreed on the 17th of June that the meeting should take place in Busseto, a small town belonging to the Marchese

¹ Together with the very laconic entries in *Acta Consist.* (EHSES, IV., 344, n. 1), see SADOLETO, *Opera*, II., 210 *seq.*

² *Cf.* Lett. ined. di C. Gualteruzzi di Fano, Pesaro, 1834, 47; GUALANO, 65 *seq.*

Pallavicini; both parties were to be accompanied by an equal number of retainers. A consistory on the 18th of June approved of this arrangement, whereupon Cardinals Parisio and Cervini were appointed Legates to the Emperor.¹

In Parma Paul III. received the Bishop of Vienna, Frederick Nausea, who, as he had repeatedly asked permission to do, communicated his views to the Pope and handed him the manuscript of his *Sylvæ Synodales*.²

Paul III. reached Busseto with fourteen Cardinals on June the 21st. They remained there till the evening of the 25th of June, when the Pope returned to Parma and the Emperor went on to Cremona.³ In the long and repeated interviews between the Emperor and the Pope all the points of dispute between them were examined.⁴ It was decided

¹ See the original sources collected in EHSES (IV., 334, n. 1).

² The invitation to join the Pope was sent to Nausea by a brief of May 16, 1543, as an answer to his last letter of April 25 (see *supra*, p. 165). Nausea proposed to the Pope, Cologne or Ratisbon for the Council, but met with great opposition. Notwithstanding he held firmly to his proposal and published in 1545 a work specially in its favour (*cf.* PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 293, n. 2, where Nausea's communications with the Pope are assigned incorrectly to 1542). *Cf.* EHSES, IV., 327, n. 2.

³ See Gualterius in EHSES, IV., 344, n. 1; VANDENESSE, II., 256, and the *letter of Charles V. to Ferdinand I. of June 29, 1543 (Court and State Archives, Vienna). V. Gambarà wrote a fine sonnet on the meeting (Rime e lett., 9; *cf.* Giorn. d. lett. Ital., IX., 338).

⁴ See for the following the important *letter of Charles V. to Ferdinand I. of June 29, 1543, in Court and State Archives, Vienna (from which KORTE [p. 87] gives a passage relating to the Council; the date July 29 in Korte is a printer's error), as well as the Imperial explanations to Philip and de Vega in GAYANGOS, VI., 2, n. 153, 282, pp. 376, 560 *seq.* Among the historians the account of JOVIUS (Hist. I., 48) stands high. Adriani, Sandoval, and Sarpi err, as EHSES (IV., 349, n. 1) well observes, in bringing forward excessive charges against Paul III., and Pallavicini (l. 5, c. 2-3) goes into the opposite extreme

that further negotiations should be held in Rome over the Spanish pragmatic policy. The nomination of Cardinals of Imperial leanings, as wished for by Charles, fell through, for Paul III. held firmly that in the event of such a creation corresponding claims on the part of France would have to be considered. Charles V. proposed further that the hostile relations between the Pope and Ascanio Colonna should be brought to an end by the marriage of a son of Ascanio with Vittoria, the Pope's niece, an arrangement which meant the rupture of the negotiations begun over a marriage of this lady with the Duke of Orleans. Another question handled at Busseto related to the possession of Milan; this was a matter closely bound up with the most important topic with which the diplomacy of that day had to deal: the reconciliation of Charles V. and Francis I.

The plan already ventilated of conferring Milan on a third party was one which had been brought to the Emperor's immediate attention by his warmest adherent in the Sacred College—Cardinal Carpi. The latter had maintained in a memorial on the subject that Charles ought not to be Count, Duke, or Prince, but solely the Emperor; he ought to be the owner not of many provinces but of great fiefs. With the possession of Milan his luck had deserted him. The restoration of the Duchy to Francis I. would not satisfy the latter's thirst for territory but only whet that appetite the more; but he himself also ought not to be the owner, since thus he increased the number of his enemies and raised the suspicion that he was covetous of foreign countries. In the case of his wiping out this suspicion by erecting Milan into a special Duchy, Francis I. would no longer have adherents, Charles on the contrary would have Germany and Italy on his side, his of advocacy (*cf.* also AFFÒ, 49 *seq.*; RANKE, *Päpste*, III., 36*; BRISCHAR, I., 131 *seq.*).

banners would fly over the most remote lands, and he would win undying glory.¹

If the Emperor, then, was neither to resign Milan to the French nor keep it as his own, it might appear to him to be a good way of escape out of the difficulty to bestow it as a favour on Ottavio, his son-in-law, the Pope's nephew. This scheme, which was not a new one, was recommended to Charles at Genoa by Pier Luigi Farnese and now at Busseto made a subject of serious consultation. Charles had, in fact, no counter-project to suggest as to how he could then compass the desired peace.²

It seems that at the outset a hope had arisen of coming to an agreement on this basis, if it were true that the viceroy of Milan, the Marquis del Vasto, had already greeted, as was said, Margaret as Duchess of Milan. That Charles should have entered seriously into a "bargain over Milan" certainly appears questionable in view of the strategical importance of the place, but the Farnesi were counting on the financial necessity of the Emperor, who had only just handed over to Duke Cosimo the fortifications of Florence and Leghorn for money.³

¹ See *Discurso de Rev. Card. di Carpi del 1543 a Carlo V. Cesare del modo del dominare (Corsini Library, Rome, n. 443). RANKE (Päpste, I., 6th ed., 162), who used this manuscript, thinks that the discourse perhaps dates from 1542; but there are also other copies, as the three in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (Cod. Ital., 10075, n. 3; 10076, n. 14; and Cod. 1067 [St. Victor]), and Cod. Urb., 855, f. 66 *seq.*, of the Vatican Library, which have the date 1543.

² Cf. EHSES, IV., 349, n. 1.

³ See Giovio's letters of June 15 and July 19, 1543, in ATANAGI, 63 *seq.* Giovio's opinion that Siena was also under consideration has been otherwise confirmed (see Mitteil. des österr. Instituts, XXIII., 129, n. 1). Aquila and Tarento were also spoken of, as the *reports to the Duchess of Urbino of June 16, 1543, clearly show (State Archives, Florence, Urb. 266, f. 534).

The amount which Paul III. was to give for Milan had been discussed already in Genoa with Pier Luigi. The Emperor's demands were enormous; at first two, then one million ducats, with perhaps yet other hard conditions such as the retention of the citadels of Milan and Cremona. It was owing to the exorbitant demands of Charles that the negotiations on this point at Busseto came to a standstill.¹ They were not broken off; as Charles instructed his son to discuss² the matter with the Spanish Council of State, the Farnesi still cherished a hope of attaining their object.

Although on this question Paul III., under family pressure, made himself deeply subservient to nepotism, he never lost sight of active endeavours to effectuate a peace. Giovio bears witness with what rare shrewdness and wonderful memory he availed himself of every opportunity that was of service to that object. As the Emperor in the bitterness of his enmity to Francis I. would not listen to the Pope's representations, the latter asked him to hear the Cardinals. Charles assented, and on June the 24th he appeared in the midst of the Sacred College. To the brilliant speech in which Cardinal Grimani recommended peace the Emperor replied with emphasis and conviction. With rising emotion he defended his old standpoint, so often explained before. As Paolo Giovio on taking his departure kissed his hand, the Emperor remarked: "Get ready to write, and give a correct account in your history book, for the war that is about to take place will furnish you with fresh and troublesome material." Paul III. expressed astonishment at the Emperor's passionate

¹ See together with the authorities cited, *supra*, p. 174, n. 4, the *letter of June 16, 1543, from Girolamo Guicciardini to Cosimo I. (State Archives, Florence), already produced by RANKE (Päpste, I., 6th ed., 164, n.).

² Cf. GAYANGOS, VI., 2, p. 377 *seq.*; cf. *ibid.*, 453, 481.

temperament, but gave assurance that in any case he would stand by King Ferdinand in his resistance to the Turks—a promise which was kept.¹

With regard to the Council the Pope, taking into consideration the war in Europe and the danger arising from the Turk, proposed to the Emperor at Busseto² that the Council should be suspended to a more suitable moment and at the same time that some place should be chosen other than Trent, which was unhealthy, cramped, and ill supplied with provisions. To this the Imperial ministers objected that the Diet of Ratisbon had agreed to Trent and demanded the immediate tenure of the Council; therefore, without consulting the Estates, the Emperor could not consent either to the suspension or the translation of the Council. As no agreement was reached, the Pope finally promised to take the advice of the Cardinals.

In Trent during the last days of June Morone, in compliance with instructions from Farnese, drew up an interrogatory circular for the prelates asking what they thought ought to be done.³ The opinions were divided; immediate translation to another place was favoured by the Archbishop of Corfù and the Bishops of Chironia, Feltre, Bertinoro, and Belcastro. Their principal reason rested on the consideration that the Synod, if it were to take place in Trent, would be essentially a Council of Germans under the influence of the Emperor, since the French bishops would not come to that city. Also, the assembly being authorized as a General Council by the Pope might easily, under

¹ For the troops sent by the Pope (4000 men), see MANANTE, 275; EHSES, IV., 250.

² According to the Emperor's own instructions to his new orator at the Roman Curia, Juan de Vega, of July 4, 1543 (GAYANGOS, IV., 2, n. 282, p. 560; EHSES, IV., 347, n. 1).

³ Morone to Farnese, dat. June 30, 1543 (EHSES, IV., 345-348).

those circumstances, be more dangerous than even a national council in Germany, to which also, perhaps, obstacles of the same kind might arise. The above-named bishops also put their objections in writing, and sent them to Farnese.

The Archbishop of Otranto, on the contrary, saw the greatest danger in the threatened national council and was of opinion that the most important question now was how to prevent the latter, since during the existing period of unrest it was impossible to carry out the Council at Trent or elsewhere; the best course, he thought, would be to sustain the hope of a Council as it had existed hitherto, since a translation undertaken without the consent of the German princes, who had approved of Trent, would only offer them a temptation to take arbitrary proceedings. If, sooner or later, peace were brought about, the Council then could either be held in Trent, as the removal of external disadvantages was a matter of possibility, or be transferred elsewhere with the consent of all parties. This opinion of the Archbishop of Otranto, Morone added, was also in agreement with that of the Bishop of Hildesheim and the other agents of the Cardinal of Mayence, who recently had been so much disturbed by the departure of the two Legates from Trent and whose last hope for the rescue of the Catholic remnant in Germany was bound up with the stability of the Council at Trent, while the dissolution of the latter or its removal from thence might be followed by the worst results. The present war also might soon come to an end, and with its cessation the chief obstacle to the Council would disappear. The Bishop of Eichstätt, when Morone was writing, was on his way to visit the Pope.

Morone himself, in view of the great danger to Germany under all circumstances, was with difficulty able to adopt

a decided attitude. On the one side there was present to his mind the assumption that the General Synod of the Church was now certainly impossible, on the other that the national synod or a Diet dealing with matters of religion was hardly avoidable, in which case the best course perhaps would be to revoke the publication of the Council and to announce by a Bull the impracticability of convening that assembly at Trent. In that case a Christian reformation might be carried out at once in those countries where the Papal obedience still prevailed. But Morone was still unable to make up his mind to recommend this method. He gave as his reason that this involved the assumption that Germany was lost beyond hope, an assumption from which conclusions must be drawn perilous to the rest of Christendom. Nor was Morone more attracted by the recommendation to prorogue the Council, since such a step, taken without the consent of the German princes, would affect the Empire in exactly the same way as a complete dissolution. He was therefore most inclined to associate himself with the opinion of the Archbishop of Otranto, as thereby at least he would not be an accomplice in the inevitable ruin of Germany.

After his meeting with Paul III. the Emperor began his journey towards Trent, while the Papal decision on the question of the Council was awaited, and took up his quarters in that city from the 2nd to the 5th of July.¹ In the suite of Charles V. were some Spanish bishops who now, when it was too late, expressed their willingness to take part in the Council and immediately afterwards departed.²

In Bologna, whither the Pope had returned on the 1st of

¹ Morone to Farnese, dat. July 2 and 4, 1543 (*ibid.*, 348 *seqq.*).

² EHSES, IV., 251.

July,¹ he was delayed only by the expectation of Morone's report and that of the bishops assembled in Trent. On the arrival of these documents it was decided in a consistory held on July the 6th that the Council should be suspended until a more convenient date; the resumption of the Synod was reserved for the Pope's decision. The Bull of suspension is of the same date, July the 6th; it makes retrospective mention of the Pope's efforts, calls attention to the six months' period of suspense in Trent, and states as reasons for the momentary impossibility of holding the Synod the war between the Christian princes and the Turkish danger; Morone was recalled, and the prelates assembled in Trent dismissed.² The Bull was not published until September the 19th;³ a brief of July the 6th informed Morone of the consistorial decision.⁴ He and the bishops waited in vain for the arrival of the Bull to enable them to take their departure,⁵ but not until July the 25th did a brief arrive giving permission to leave Trent. Morone thereupon took his departure and the others dispersed;⁶ at the same time briefs announcing the suspension of the Council and giving the grounds for this decision were sent out to a number of metropolitans and princes.⁷

¹ Diary of Gaultierius (*cf. supra*, p. 169, n. 3), Secret Archives of the Vatican.

² The Bull of suspension of July 6, 1543, in EHSES, IV., 352-355. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 4, n. 20; KORTE, 69 *seq.* See Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 419.

³ EHSES, IV., 352, n. 4; MERKLE, *loc. cit.*

⁴ EHSES, IV., 352.

⁵ Morone to Farnese, dat. July 12 and 25, 1543 (*ibid.*, 352, n. 3, 356).

⁶ *Ibid.*, 356, n. 3.

⁷ The brief to the Cardinal of Mayence from Bologna of July 10, 1543 (*ibid.*, 335 *seq.*); similar briefs to the Archbishop of Salzburg, Treves, Bremen, Besançon, Gnesen; on July 21 to the Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria and to the King of Poland (*cf. ibid.*, 356).

The suspension was undoubtedly justified, since under the existing circumstances nothing beneficial could be expected from the Council.¹ Probably a certain number of votes were given vindictively as a retort to the Emperor's frustration of the Papal scheme concerning Milan. How far Charles V. shared this opinion must remain a matter of conjecture; what is certain is that as every prospect of his holding Milan for Ottavio Farnese melted away his relations with Paul III. became more and more delicate.² To this many other causes contributed; in order to keep the Protestants in a state of inaction, the Imperial diplomatists took care that they should be made aware of the tension which had arisen between the Pope and their master. With this object the bitter letter that Charles V. had addressed to Paul III. on the 25th of August 1542 was translated into German and circulated in printed copies.³ The document thus acquired an increased importance, and what a damaging effect such a measure must have had in Rome can easily be imagined.⁴

The fresh state of tension between the Emperor and the Pope led of necessity to nearer relations between the latter and Francis I., an approximation which might become all the closer as the party of Charles V. in the Sacred College

¹ K. A. MENZEL, II., 310.

² According to the **Vita di Alfonso d' Avalos, Marchese del Vasto* (MS. in Cod. 34, E. 23, f. 267, of the Chigi Library, Rome), Charles V. had looked upon the Pope in this matter as a downright simpleton.

³ Cf. EHSES, IV., 238. For the long and violent letter of excuse from Francis I. in 1543, in which he tried to throw all the blame on the Emperor, cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 1, n. 3; EHSES, IV., 245, n. 2.

⁴ Paul III. (see **Diarium of Gualterius, Secret Archives of the Vatican*) left Bologna on July 11, stayed in Ancona from the 20th to the 23rd, from July 30 to Aug. 8 in Perugia, from 13th to 16th in Viterbo, and returned on 19th to Rome.

had been reduced to very slender dimensions.¹ The French King had for a long time been making efforts in a very tactful way to wipe out to some extent the stigma which he had incurred by his alliance with the infidel. When the Turkish flotilla under Chaireddin Barbarossa appeared at the mouth of the Tiber at the end of June 1543, the French commissary who was on board made it publicly known that the Papal territory had nothing to fear. The Turks in fact refrained from any acts of plunder and soon afterwards withdrew from the coasts of the Papal States.² The attitude also taken by Francis towards the religious innovations in France could not fail to produce a favourable effect upon the Pope. A few weeks after the declaration of war against Charles V. the King had ordered the Parliaments to take severe measures of

¹ On March 30, 1543, Cardinal E. Gonzaga had already spoken in a *letter to the Marchese del Vasto of the "pochi servitori, che si truova S. M. nel collegio nostro, per la qual cosa un dì potriamo vedersi far un papa tutto francese" who could do great harm. On Dec. 12, 1543, the Cardinal insists in a *letter to D. Ferrante, in connection with the death of Cardinal Grimaldi, "that there are but few servants of the Emperor in the Cardinalate, and such as there are (Accolti, Cibo) are so powerless that he beseeches earnestly that some steps may be taken to strengthen the party" (Cod. Barb. lat., 5790, f. 150, and 5791, f. 165, of the Vatican Library.) Cf. also in Appendix No. 22 E. Gonzaga's letter of March 18, 1544.

² Cf. JOVIUS, Hist., I., 43, the reports in the *Mittel. des österr. Instituts*, XXIII., 130, and the *Ephem. in Cod. Vat., 6978, t. 148: "Die 29 Junii 1543 Romae disseminatum est Turcarum classem Ostia capta infestam adventare, eoque nuncio populus ita consternatus est, ut plerique metu aufugerint, omnes autem exsanguī vultu formidabundi huc illuc concursaverint. Indignum facinus, quae urbs olim orbi terrarum pavori fuit eam tunc inani timore percussam trepidasse!—Hoc mense junio 1543 Regium Iulium civitas Brutiorum a Turcarum classe duce Barbarossa direpta et incensa est, incolis omnibus secum captivis abductis" (Vatican Library).

repression against all who showed disobedience to the Church; throughout the whole kingdom proceedings against the Protestants were ushered on to the stage with demonstrative effect. In this way not only was the Pope favourably impressed, but Charles V. and Ferdinand I. were also at the same time, with their obsequiousness towards the German Protestants, placed in a very prejudicial light before the eyes of Catholic Christendom.¹

As the crowning touch of all came the alliance of the Emperor with Henry VIII. of England. Charles V. made necessity his excuse for this connection whereby he was to protect himself against the combination, far more perilous to Christendom, of France and the Turks. His ambassador in Rome renewed his demands that the weapons of ecclesiastical and temporal power should be wielded against Francis; this was all the more urgent since the King had provided the Turkish ships with every supply which could enable them to attack Nice. Paul III. replied to the Emperor's representative that if he were to direct his arms against the French, he could not dispose of them at sea and on land in Hungary, as was at present the case, to the advantage of the house of Hapsburg, but that if he brought ecclesiastical pressure to bear on Francis he would be exposing the Holy See to the danger of losing France just as it already had lost England. Besides, he saw himself placed in the necessity of now exercising also his functions as a judge and of examining with which of the two contending parties lay the guilt of hindering the consummation of the peace which was so necessary for the world.²

The Imperialists tried to excuse the policy of their master by calling attention to the dissimilarity of the alliances

¹ Cf. SOLDAN, I., 179 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 4, n. 22.

² PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 4, n. 25 *seq.*

formed by Charles and by Francis. The alliance of the Emperor and Henry VIII. aimed solely at victory over the French and consequently over their allies the Turks, it did not mean the support of the English monarch in his aggressions on the Holy See; much rather was there ground for hope that the Emperor would be successful in bringing Henry once more into the right way.¹

Paul III. was not moved from his standpoint of neutrality.² As the mediator of peace he determined on November the 21st, 1543, to send Cardinal Alessandro Farnese as Legate to both the sovereigns.³ In order to gain the support of the German princes for his endeavours on behalf of peace, the Bishop of Sarno, Francesco Sfondrato, was despatched soon after; he was at the same time directed to justify the Pope's attitude in the question of the Council.⁴

Farnese was given the Legatine cross in an assembly of Cardinals on the 27th of November 1543. The Imperial ambassador, Juan de Vega, who had replaced Aguilar⁵ in the summer of 1543, took this opportunity of trying to induce the Pope to come to an open breach with France. He laid, in fact, before the Pope a letter from Francis I. to his son the Duke of Orleans, together with a supplementary instruction to the latter from which it appeared that the King was seeking the friendship of the Landgrave of Hesse and showed himself ready to introduce Protestantism into

¹ PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 4, n. 25 *seq.*

² See Legaz. di A. Serristori, 130 *seq.*

³ Acta Consist. in PIEPER, 126. Cf. DRUFFEL, Karl V., I., 7 *seq.*

⁴ Sfondrato's instructions of Nov. 30, 1543, in EHSSES, IV., 257 *seq.*; Morone's memorial for Farnese, based on the same grounds, of Nov. 25, 1543, in PIEPER, 183-185. For Sfondrato's execution of his task, see DRUFFEL, *loc. cit.*, I., 8 *seq.*

⁵ Cf. GAYANGOS, VI., 2, xlv *seq.*; *ibid.*, n. 282, the instructions for Vega, dated July 4, 1543.

Luxembourg. But Paul III. was not to be drawn into any precipitate measures; he postponed an inquiry into the circumstances until the next consistory. On this occasion he discounted the Imperial ambassador's eulogies of his master's adherence to the Holy See, the reward of which fidelity was to be a forced alliance on the Pope's part against France, by ordering a report to be presented through Cardinal Parisio on certain pragmatic decrees issued in Spain by Charles V. of a nature derogatory to the rights and freedom of the Church. With regard to the documents impleaded against the King of France, since they were the originals, it was resolved that the nuncio should have speech with the King upon the matter and receive from him his justification.

In the consistory of the 19th of December 1543 a heated altercation took place between the Pope and the Cardinal of Burgos, Juan Alvarez de Toledo. The latter complained of the severe sentence passed on the pragmatic measures taken in Spain, while similar enactments in France and other countries passed into law without criticism. When Paul III. remarked that he was opposed in general to all such legislation, but that the Spanish was much the most objectionable, the Cardinal retorted: "The French alliance with the Turks and yet other things worse than that were winked at." The Pope brought the discussion to an end by referring to the Emperor's alliance with Henry VIII., which was worse than a compact with the Turks.¹

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 5, and the copious authorities given in EHSES, IV., 378, n.; see here also for the Spanish Pragmatic of April 2, 1544. For the efforts of Charles V. in Spain to carry out an anti-papal and State Church policy, see RANKE, Osmanen, 225 *seq.*, and ARMSTRONG, II., 65 *seq.* Here are some remarks on Paul III. and the Spanish Inquisition on behalf of which Charles intervened. With regard to the French Pragmatic arrangements, see SCHMIDT, Französ.

Cardinal Farnese, accompanied by Giovanni Ricci and Niccolò Ardinghelli, had left Rome on the 28th of November 1543. He travelled first to the seat of the French court, where a very respectful reception greeted him; thence on the 6th of January 1544¹ he went to the Emperor. On reaching Brussels on the 12th he found that Charles had already left, and not until the 20th of January did the Cardinal come up with him, at Kreuznach; on the 23rd both made their entry on horseback into Worms.

Farnese delivered a letter from the Pope to the Emperor exhorting to peace. In order to conduce to the restoration of peace between the Emperor and the King he made certain proposals in which the surrender of Milan or the cession of Savoy to France were suggested. Charles V. was convinced that the Pope's peace proposals were mere words which held out no prospect of results. He was determined, as he himself said, neither to allow himself to be caught nor to give up the execution of his plans and the pursuit of the military undertakings which he had entered upon in order to re-acquire what had already been wrested from him. He declared to the Cardinal that, as long as a hand's breadth of Italian soil was in the grasp of France, a peace was impossible. The Emperor was so excited that he hardly allowed Farnese to finish his speech, and he broke

Gesch., II., 685. For the tension then existing in the relations between the Pope and the Emperor, *cf.* Serristori's *reports of Dec. 12, 16, and 22, 1543 (State Archives, Florence). The accusation brought in 1546 by L. Malatesta that the Farnese family had, previous to the meeting at Busseto (!), conspired through Matteo Varano against the life of Charles V. (see Arch. stor. Ital., 5th Series, XVI., 98), deserves no credence (see BROSCH in the Mitteil. des österr. Instituts, XXIII., 131 *seq.*; *cf.* specially MASSIGNAN, *Di una supposta congiura ordita dai Farnesi contra la vita di Carlo V.*, Padova, 1901).

¹ *Cf.* Dandino's *letter, dat. Paris, Jan. 9, 1544. Nunz. di Francia, 2 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

in upon his explanations with the words: "Monsignore, through us you hold the Archbishopric of Monreale, your father became Duke of Novara, Ottavio Farnese received the hand of our daughter with an income of 20,000 ducats; in order to come to agreement with his Holiness we have suffered the loss of two of our best friends, the Duke of Urbino and Ascanio Colonna; and now we are so treated, and must submit to it, that the Vicar of Christ, who has received so many benefits at our hands, is ready to join forces with the King of France or rather, we should say, with the Turk. He may well look to it that we do not deal the same measure to him that we dealt to Clement VII."

The Cardinal's attempt to justify the Pope's action was dismissed by Charles with the remark that he knew more than enough of the obstinacy of Paul III. It was therefore superfluous to have more words on the matter. The Cardinal, who during this painful interview had shown great self-command, asked at its close that he might have the Emperor's permission to discuss the question further with Granvelle; to that Charles V. offered no objection.

With the Emperor in this frame of mind there was little to hope for from negotiations with Granvelle and Idiaquez. On the 24th of January the Cardinal had once more an audience of the Emperor to which also Granvelle, Idiaquez, and the nuncio Poggio were admitted. The long debates, in which religious questions as well as political were bandied to and fro, were entirely fruitless. On Farnese entreating that at the coming Diet the interests of religion should be borne in mind, the Emperor asked him what counsels in particular the Pope had to impart to him. When the Cardinal replied to this apologetically that he had no instructions, Charles rejoined that at previous Diets the representatives of Rome had done more harm

than good; at the ensuing Diet the reform of the Church and the removal of abuses would be dealt with; he was resolved to do his duty as a Christian prince.

Farnese could not conceal from himself that his mission was a total failure. The Emperor rejected all overtures to France and showed openly that in the approaching Diet he would have no impediment raised to his negotiations with the Protestants by the presence of a Papal Legate. The Cardinal was still sufficiently master of himself to avoid an open rupture, and in order to facilitate the re-adjustment of relationships he declared the Pope's readiness to give 50,000 ducats to the funds of the Catholic League. Sfondrato remained behind to attend to the settlement of this point, while Farnese at once began his return journey to Rome.¹

The Emperor went from Worms to Spire for the Diet, where he hoped the Estates would give him open-handed support in obtaining a full reckoning from France. In this he was successful, since in the Recess of June the 10th 1544 he made such large concessions to the powerful confederates of Schmalkald as well-nigh to give away the Catholic cause.²

In this Recess the Council was spoken of in a manner

¹ The principal authority for Farnese's negotiations with the Emperor is the report intended for Vega's information in LANZ, Staatspapiere, 346 *seqq.* Cf. also Comment. de Charles V., 80; DRUFFEL, Karl V., i, 14 *seq.*, and GAYANGOS, VII., 7, n. 18 *seq.* That the report in Lanz should be dated Jan. 25, 1544, had already been pointed out by Gachard before Druffel (Biogr. nat., III., 682). A very important addition for the audience given to Farnese by Charles V. is contained in the letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga of March 18, 1544, given in Appendix No. 22, and found by me in the Vatican Library.

² Cf. MENZEL (II., 325), who concurs with this opinion, MAURENBRECHER (p. 61), JANSSEN-PASTOR (III., 18th ed., 579) and BEZOLD (p. 747).

and in terms which were entirely Protestant ; the authority of Pope and Church were passed by without mention. As it was uncertain whether and how soon "a common, Christian, free Council" would be held, a fresh Diet ought to be summoned before the expiry of another year or a German national synod called to settle the religious question in Germany pending the meeting of a General Council, all to be done without participation by the Pope, in accordance with proposals emanating from the Emperor and the Estates of the Empire through their theologians. During the interval concessions surpassing all their boldest hopes would be made to the Protestants in respect of the sequestrated Church property, the re-constitution of the Imperial Court of Chancery, and the cases affecting religion still in litigation. The cases were to be quashed and assessors belonging to the Protestant party admitted to the Court of Chancery. Finally, the Catholics were bound to contribute to the churches and institutions which had been taken possession of by the Protestants.¹

The resolutions of Spires, a copy of which reached Rome through Verallo in the middle of July, must have given the greatest offence to the Pope. The French party in Rome exulted ; they hoped now to bring Paul III. completely round ; as early as March, after Farnese's return,² the French thought that their goal was in sight. The Cardinal-Legate's ungracious reception and speedy dismissal by the

¹ See *Neue Sammlung der Reichsabscheide*, II., 495 *seq.* For the Diet of Spires, *cf.* HÄBERLIN, XII., 473 *seq.* ; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 576 *seq.* ; WINKELMANN, III., 358 *seq.*, and DE BOOR, *Beitr. zur Geschichte des Speirer Reichstages von 1544*, Strassburg, 1878.

² The Cardinal re-entered Rome on March 1, 1544 ; see RAYNALDUS, 1545, n. 1.

Emperor made all the more impression on the susceptible Pope¹ as they were in sharp contrast to the brilliant advances of the French court. The results of Farnese's mission to France consisted in the agreement of Francis I. to the marriage of the Duke of Orleans and Vittoria Farnese, whose dowry was to be made up of Parma and Piacenza. In return the King demanded of the Pope an open declaration in his favour and against Charles V. This Pier Luigi now sought to prevent with all his power. This man's influence over Paul III. was then unusually great, for Farnese was at the time making ostensibly a change for the better in his mode of life. According to the account given by Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, Pier Luigi did not cease to represent to the Pope that a war with the Emperor must inevitably bring with it in its train the ruin of the family of Farnese.² In consequence of this no express and public hostility to Charles was evinced, but it was perceptible from other signs that the Pope's preference was veering towards France.

It was not merely the censure on April the 2nd of the Spanish pragmatic measures which filled the Imperial party in Rome with anxiety; they found no less cause for apprehension in the Pope's repeated evening conversations and the secret proceedings in consistory.³ About this time the ambassador de Vega had begun to drop all diplomatic considerations. When on the 3rd of April he met, at the house of Margaret, the Emperor's daughter and wife of

¹ He had been much displeased at Charles V. for not awaiting the Cardinal's presence in the Netherlands; see F. Babbi's *report, Jan. 17, 1544 (State Archives, Florence).

² Cf. in Appendix No. 22 Cardinal E. Gonzaga's important letter of March 18, 1544 (Vatican Library). Pier Luigi's reformation, if meant seriously, did not last long (cf. LUZIO, Pronostico, XXXIV.).

³ See Legazioni di A. Serristori, 133, 135.

Ottavio, Cardinal Alessandro, and the latter used expressions of courtesy towards the Emperor, de Vega replied that such words were worthless; he wished to see deeds. Passing on to the secret transactions in consistory, the ambassador observed that he knew that the betrothal of Vittoria to the Duke of Orleans had been discussed; such a violation of neutrality would bring with it the ruin of his Holiness, the ruin of the Holy See and of the house of Farnese.¹

Matters became still more acute when Margaret in her impetuous way took up the Imperial party with intensity and allowed herself to make disparaging remarks on the "Farnese brood."² Paul III.'s enemies, Cosimo de' Medici and Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, flung oil on the flames.³ Cosimo's representative informed de Vega that his Duke had been informed that with the favourable connivance of the Farnesi, French recruiting was going on in the Papal States.

De Vega forgot himself so entirely as to reply to Pier Luigi, who, before leaving for Parma, had conveyed to him his willingness to do something for the Emperor, that he would certainly let the latter know how badly his servants and relatives demeaned themselves.⁴ A similarly sharp expression was used by Charles himself towards the Papal nuncio.⁵ Yielding to the pressure from Henry VIII., he at last even made up his mind to recall his ambassador from Rome.⁶

¹ See *Legazioni di A. Serristori*, 136.

² *Ibid.*, 139.

³ *Cf.* Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letters to D. Ferrante of March 18 and 25 and April 5. Cod. Barb. lat., 5792, f. 20, 23, 26^b *seq.* (Vatican Library).

⁴ *Legazioni di A. Serristori*, 139.

⁵ See B. Ruggieri's report in *BALAN*, VI., 363, n. 3.

⁶ See *DRUFFEL*, Karl V., I., 63, and *EHSSES*, IV., 377, n. 8.

On the evening of May the 22nd de Vega secretly left Rome¹ without taking leave of the Pope and without leaving any representative behind. While this critical situation lasted Alessandro Farnese maintained the undisturbed calm of the practised diplomatist. A short time before, when Margaret one day blurted out, "Don't you see that in view of the Emperor's indubitable victory you are preparing the ruin of your house?" he replied, "Madam, when the Emperor's victory is an assured fact—then our position will at once be clearly taken. But who knows what is going to happen?"²

These words denote plainly the actual situation of affairs. Papal diplomacy before taking a definite position wished to know what the outcome of the great contest was to be. A friend of Cardinal Gonzaga was of opinion, in the beginning of June, that Paul III. would think more than thrice before he made open cause with Francis I.³ But that in view of the Emperor's threatening demeanour the Pope should have thought of making his position sure by an alliance with Venice and the Catholic Estates of Germany can cause no surprise.⁴ On the 9th of June Cardinal Ippolito d'Este arrived in Rome as French ambassador, after having previously, certainly without success, tried to woo the Republic into an alliance.⁵ The reception prepared for him was exceptionally magnificent, and his apartments were in the palace of the Cancelleria. The Romans now believed that the triple

¹ He only informed Margaret and Serristori; see the *report of latter of May 23, 1544 (Florentine State Archives).

² Legazioni di A. Serristori, 140.

³ See Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letter to Granvelle of June 3, 1544. Cod. Barb. lat., 5792, f. 64 (Vatican Library).

⁴ See EHSES, IV., 377, n. 8.

⁵ See BROSCH in the Mitteil. des österr. Inst., XXIII., 132 *seq.*; Atti Mod., IV., 142, 158 *seq.*

alliance of Rome, France, and Venice was already concluded, especially as the city was full of rumours of the seductive offers held out by Francis to the members of the Farnese family.¹

The Romans were as much deceived as those diplomats who thought that the Emperor's ominous attitude at Spires and other signs of enmity from the Imperialists² would drive the Pope to an open rupture with the temporal head of Christendom; Giovio, as was shown, was a much shrewder judge of the situation when he wrote, in his caustic way, on June the 7th to the Duke of Ferrara, "Pope Paul as a man of common-sense and high character will certainly remain neutral. The day after to-morrow the Cardinal of Ferrara will be here knocking at a door which won't open. His Holiness will wrap himself up tightly and hang weights on his feet so as to elude any temptation to take flight. It is said that the Cardinal of Ferrara will, as he did in Venice, pray here also for help; but St. Peter will stand just as neutral as St. Mark."³

Even if Paul III. had secret inclinations towards the side of France,⁴ he still avoided an open declaration; for ten years he had kept his neutrality, and to that policy he clung as before. Therefore, when rumours were abroad of negotiations between the two opponents, he determined, notwithstanding his hitherto discomfiting rebuffs, in a consistory held on the 30th of July, to support the cause

¹ Cf. Arch. stor. Ital., Append., VI., 171 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, *loc. cit.*, I., 64. Cf. also ADRIANI, IV., c. 4.

² Besides Vega's departure another weight was thrown into the scale, the rumour that Charles V. had sent for Ascanio Colonna; see Serristori's *report of June 23, 1544 (State Archives, Florence).

³ DESJARDINS, III., 49, 50.

⁴ See ADRIANI, IV., c. 4; cf. BROSCHE, I., 180, n. 1, and STAFFETTI, in Arch. stor. Ital., 5th Series, XV., 71.

of peace by the despatch of Legates. Cardinal Morone was sent to the Emperor and Cardinal Grimani to Francis I.¹

In the same consistory measures were taken with respect to the Recess of Spires, which had been so injurious to Catholic interests. Already at the beginning of June the Pope and Cardinals had discussed this question. To pass over in silence resolutions so damaging to religion and the authority of the Holy See seemed irreconcilable with the Pope's duty as the chief ruler of the Church.² Every effort ought to be made to induce the Emperor to withdraw his concessions. Giovanni Ricci, Archbishop of Siponto, who had been appointed nuncio to Portugal on the 27th of July 1544, was instructed accordingly to bring the influence of the King of Portugal, of Prince Philip of Spain, and other prominent personages in that kingdom to bear upon Charles V.³ A very severe letter of remonstrance for transmission to the Emperor himself was drawn up and read aloud in the consistory of July the 30th.⁴

This important document, the composition of which was largely the work of Cardinal Carafa, was at last completed on August the 24th after yet another discussion on the Recess of Spires in a special congregation of Cardinals. Besides the letter to the Emperor, others of similar import were addressed at the same time to his confessor Soto and to Granvelle. They contained exhortations to act counter to the Spires resolutions.

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1544, n. 20; PIEPER, 128; EHSES, IV., 363, n. 4.

² See Farnese's letters of July 22 and 23, in EHSES, IV., 358, n. 2; cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 5, n. 5.

³ See EHSES, IV., 362 *seq.*

⁴ Acta Consist. in EHSES, IV., 364, n. 2.

Protests against the Recess¹ were also sent to King Ferdinand and the Catholic princes of the Empire.

In the comprehensive brief addressed to Charles V.² on the 24th of August 1544 the Pope began by enforcing the duty that lay upon him of protesting against the decrees of Spires. He did not wish to incur the penalties of the high priest Heli, who left unchastised the evil doings of his sons, but to shield himself as well as the Emperor from the wrath of God. The resolutions of the Recess of Spires excluded from the treatment of religious affairs the very person who, from the first existence of the Church, had wielded the first and highest authority in that sphere. In his place laymen, even the votaries of condemned teachers of error, were indiscriminately to pronounce their decisions. Yet the Emperor ought not to listen to those enemies of the Church who whispered in his ear that the priests and pastors of the faithful were neglecting their duties and that he ought to step into their place, for even the best will and intention could not justify in the affairs of the Church, any more than in the affairs of a private household, the intrusion of alien authority into matters placed by the ordinance of God in the hands of another. Even Oza, who wished to uphold the tottering Ark of the Covenant and certainly was inspired by the best of motives, was yet instantaneously struck down by the hand of God because he did that which only the priests and Levites had a right to do. Why were Core, Dathan, and Abiron swallowed up

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1544, n. 8, 9; EHSES, IV., 364, n. 2. For the participation by Carafa, see SILOS, I., 243; Bromato, II., 94 *seq.*

² Best edition in EHSES, IV., 364-373; an Italian translation in PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 6. Another version, sharper in tone, was first published by RAYNALDUS (1544, n. 7), who supposed (mistakenly) that this was the brief actually sent to Charles V. and which is reproduced by EHSES (IV., 374-379); it is probably an early draft which afterwards was softened down in form.

in an earthquake if it were not that they arrogated to themselves the dignity and functions of the priesthood? And yet the priesthood of the Covenant was only the shadow of the Christian priesthood. King Ozias, otherwise so distinguished, was carried away by pride at his successes and, despite the opposition of the priests, entered into the holy place to kindle incense on the altar, and straightway became a leper all the days of his life. Yet to what a pitch of power and renown had God raised those Emperors who, like Constantine and Theodosius and Charles the Great, had shown honour to the priesthood of His Church. How evil had been the end of such enemies and persecutors as Anastasius, Maurice, Constans II., Justinian II., Philippinus, Leo III., and, later, Henry IV. and Frederick II. Next to the people of the Jews, who had denied the Saviour Himself, no nation had suffered severer punishments than the Greeks, whose stubborn obstinacy had hardened them in separation and apostasy from the Holy See. How then should Charles V. escape the wrath of God if he walked in the footsteps of such hostile Emperors, he the successor of those who in days gone by had been careful to render to the Church the same meed of honour which they had received from her?

The settlement of the religious difficulties lay nearer, the Pope continued, to no man's heart than to his own; but even in the pursuit of so beneficent an aim he could not yield to the Emperor the place of leadership, but only concede to him the mighty office of champion and pray him to exercise the same. More than that was not required, since on his own initiative the Pope had greeted with joy any opportunity which gave the least hope of opening the Council. On every occasion when the most slender possibility of holding the Synod showed itself he had sent his Legates; the Germans, whose reconciliation

was made increasingly difficult by the Emperor's ever-enlarged concessions, he had treated with more compliancy than any other nation, inasmuch as he had appointed Trent to be the meeting-place and had sent his Legates thither; but "I came, and there was not a man: I called, and there was none that would hear" (Isa. l. 2). Even now the Pope is not to blame if the Council is not a reality; one thing only is wanting, and that is the conclusion of peace between the Emperor and the Christian princes, Francis I. in particular, since the war is the only obstacle which has caused the postponement of the Council. The Emperor therefore has it in his power to open up the way for the Council; to the Emperor it belongs to listen in matters of faith to the Pope's voice and to give the latter a free hand in the matters appertaining to his office; to the Emperor it belongs to withdraw the concessions made with untimely leniency to the enemies of the Church. Otherwise the Pope cannot rest satisfied with mere admonition, in which even Heli was not sparing towards his sons, but with the help of God will take all those steps the neglect of which brought upon Heli so grievous a punishment.

This hortatory letter was to be delivered by Cardinal Morone. But Charles V., then in the midst of his war with Francis I., refused in the most positive way to receive the Legate. Cardinal Farnese lost no time in informing Morone of this on the 9th of September; the latter received the news at Lyons on the 15th of September and thereupon began his return journey.¹ As soon afterwards peace was concluded between Charles and Francis at Crespy, Grimani's mission also was rendered superfluous.

The Papal chamberlain David Odasio was entrusted with the delivery to Morone of the letter of expostulation.

¹ See PIEPER, 128; EHSES, IV., 365, n.

When he reached the Imperial headquarters he found, contrary to expectation, that Morone was absent. Since he had no instructions to deliver the letter to the Emperor in person, he only left a copy of it at the court and brought back the original with him to Rome, but the letters addressed to Soto and Granvelle he delivered. The presentation of the original letter to the Emperor was then committed to Flaminio Savelli, a relative of Charles, who started for Worms at the end of January 1545 in order to convey to Otto von Truchsess, Bishop of Augsburg, the insignia of the Cardinalate.¹

The communication of the letters to King Ferdinand and the Catholic Estates was entrusted to Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, Bishop of Cava, who on the 27th of August 1544 had been appointed nuncio-extraordinary to Germany. The latter accomplished his mission with such despatch that Ferdinand I. was already in possession on September the 24th of the letter addressed to the Emperor.² At the moment of its delivery the contents of this important document had already been anticipated by facts. Peace between Charles V. and Francis I. had been concluded.

The conditions agreed to at Crespy on the 17th of

¹ The duplicate despatch of the brief through Odasio and Savelli is witnessed to by Massarelli in his Diary, I., on March 25, 1545 (ed. MERKLE, I., 163). Cf. also the explanations in EHSES (IV., 364 *seq.*, n. 2), who discusses the opinions impugning the correctness of Massarelli's statements in DRUFFEL (Karl V., I., 73 *seq.*), FRIEDENSBURG (Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 24), and MERKLE (I., 421, n. 1).

² See EHSES, IV., 364, n. 2. At the Diet of Worms on April 7, 1545, Granvelle complains vehemently to Mignanelli of the Bishop of Cava's mission, especially as the brief had thus fallen into the hands of the Lutherans and afforded them opportunity for attacks (see Mignanelli's report of April 9, 1545, in the Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 97; cf. DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 42).

September, to the exclusion of the Pope,¹ signified for the French King an honourable peace. In order to settle the dispute over Milan it was stipulated that the Duke of Orleans, Francis' second son, should marry either the eldest daughter of the Emperor, Maria, or a daughter of King Ferdinand, receiving in the former case the Netherlands and in the latter Milan. The Emperor renounced his claims on Burgundy, the King restored Savoy and gave up his claims on Milan, Naples, Flanders, and Artois. Both monarchs engaged themselves to join in common warfare against the Turks and to give mutual support to each other towards the "reunion of religion." In the latter connection secret articles were agreed to that both princes should support the Council and carry out its decrees by armed force. Francis I. promised to make no more fresh alliances, especially with the Protestants of Germany.²

The conclusion of peace removed one of the principal causes of the Emperor's irritation against the Pope. Further, as a wise statesman Charles V. perceived that an answer to the letter of expostulation could not well be sent without inflicting serious injury on the honour and reputation of the two heads of Christendom;³ he also felt that in the Recess he had agreed to more "than he could be responsible for."⁴ After calm reflection he could not but see that the Pope's complaints on this score were not unjustified; statesmanship and Catholic

¹ Cf. CAPASSO, *Politica*, I., 44.

² Cf. BAUMGARTEN in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, XXVI., 31, and DRUFFEL, *Karl V.*, I., 49 *seq.*, for the date of the treaty (17 or 19 Sept.). For the sense of the last somewhat indefinitely worded article of peace and the secret tendency of the parties to the treaty, see SOLDAN, I., 186 *seq.*

³ *Commentaires*, 98; EHSES, IV., 371, n. 2, and 382, n. 1.

⁴ Conversation with the Elector of Saxony (see SCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Deutschen*, XII., 333 *seq.*).

sentiment were equal determinants in the decision to give only a verbal answer to the Pope's letter. Taking into consideration the great importance of the matters dealt with in the letter and the manner in which expressions used in that document affected the Imperial authority, dignity, and reputation, it seemed better that the Emperor's detailed reply should be reserved for a more suitable occasion. Then it could be explained and clearly proved that he had no guilty responsibility for the doleful condition of Christendom, but that personally as well as indirectly he had persistently endeavoured to avoid and ward off such calamities, as was the duty not only of a good Emperor and as the dignity and authority of the Empire demanded, but as befitted every Catholic prince who was loyal to the reverence due to the Apostolic See. If everyone according to his position and rank had so acted, the present distresses of Christendom would have been avoided.¹

The admirable self-restraint then observed by Charles V. redounded to his lasting reputation as a Catholic and a statesman. It shattered the hopes of the Protestants that the two heads of Christendom would be involved in sacrilegious strife and led the way to a combination between Pope and Emperor from which the greatest results would follow. The state of affairs demanded that a good understanding should exist between the two highest powers in the world. That these two should, especially at first, have approached each other with grave misgivings is only too intelligible from the course of previous events.

First of all, at the end of November the interrupted diplomatic relations were resumed in the regular way by the return of Vega to the post² from which he had with-

¹ DRUFFEL, Karl V., I., 78, 79.

² Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 15. Cf. Charles V.'s instructions to Vega of Dec. 2, 1544, in GAYANGOS, VII., I, n. 258.

drawn in May. Opportunity for a fresh fit of petulance was given by the nomination of Cardinals on the 19th of December, at which certainly three Spanish prelates (Francisco Mendoza de Coria, Gasparo d'Avalos of Compostela, and Bartolomé de la Cueva) were appointed to the purple, but to the exclusion of Charles's principal nominee, Pedro Pacheco. The Emperor was so unable to suppress his annoyance that he forbade the prelates above mentioned to assume their Cardinal's dress.¹ Under these circumstances it was not surprising that Pier Luigi Farnese's secretary, Annibale Caro, who was to sound the Emperor as to his master's investiture with Parma and Piacenza, met with the very worst reception.² The Bishop of Trent, Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, and the Bishop of

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 18 *seq.* Red hats were also bestowed on Dec. 19, 1544, on: two Frenchmen, George d'Armagnac and Jacques d'Annebaut; one German: the Bishop of Augsburg, Otto Truchsess von Waldburg, and seven Italians: Francesco Sfondrato, Federigo Cesi, Niccolò Ardinghello, Andrea Cornaro, Girolamo Capodiferro, Durante de' Duranti, and Tiberio Crispo. With the exception of the two last all were excellent men who had often distinguished themselves in ecclesiastical posts. Cf. CIACONIUS, III., 688 *seqq.*, and CARDELLA, IV., 253 *seq.* (in the names of the bishoprics here attributed to the above named there are numerous errors). For Truchsess, see *Histor. Jahrb.*, VII., 177 *seq.*, 369 *seq.*, XX., 71 *seq.*; *Allgem. deutsche Biogr.*, XXIV., 634 *seqq.*; WETZER and WELTE, *Kirchenlexicon*, XII., 2nd ed., 114 *seq.*; the Cardinal's brief for Truchsess is in EHSES, IV., 440, n. 2. For Cesi, see GARAMPI, App. 253; *ibid.*, 262 *seq.*, for Capodiferro and Cornaro. For N. Ardinghello, see MAZZUCHELLI, I., 2, 981 *seq.* For Mendoza, see *Fonds grec de l'Escorial*, 43 *seqq.* The elevation of Durante and Crispo, in surprising contrast to the usual caution of Paul III. in his nominations, is attributed by Massarelli to the influence of the covetous Costanza Farnese who had deceived the Pope (*Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 195, 196).

² See AFFÒ, 62 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 21, 638.

Augsburg, Cardinal Otto von Truchsess, then undertook with success to renew closer relations between the Pope and the Hapsburg brothers.¹

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 23 *seq.* For the very strained relations between Paul III. and Charles V. in the spring of 1545, see the *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga of March 7, 1545, in Appendix No. 23 (Vatican Library).

CHAPTER V.

SPREAD OF THE GERMAN SCHISM.—CARDINAL FARNESE'S MISSION TO WORMS.—NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN ALLIANCE BETWEEN PAUL III. AND CHARLES V. AGAINST THE PROTESTANTS.—INVESTITURE OF PIER LUIGI FARNESE WITH PARMA AND PIACENZA.—THE CONVENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

THE concurrent pressure upon the house of Hapsburg from the Turks and the French since the year 1541 had been used by the Schmalkaldic League as an opportunity for usurping authority over the Catholic Estates of the Empire and introducing the new ecclesiastical system into regions of Germany which hitherto had been Catholic. To the protestantizing of the bishoprics of Naumburg, Zeitz, and Meissen had succeeded the campaign of the Elector John Frederick of Saxony and the Landgrave Philip of Hesse against Duke Henry of Brunswick, the last prince of importance who still held fast in northern Germany to the ancient faith. The enterprise was successful, for Henry was unprepared for war; the Schmalkaldic forces had no difficulty in taking possession of the Duchy, into which they at once introduced the new doctrines. After that the overthrow of the old Catholic conditions in Hildesheim and Thuringian Mühlhausen was also carried out by means of violence. In south Germany the year 1542 saw the introduction of the Protestant teaching into the city of Ratisbon, while in the following year the Count

Palatine, Otto Henry of Pfalz-Neuburg gave his adhesion to the same cause.¹

On the Lower Rhine still heavier losses awaited the Church. There no less a personage than the Prince Elector and Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann von Wied, threatened to secede. The total incapacity of this prelate in theological learning—he had never succeeded in becoming master of the Latin language—was in strong contrast with his passionate interference in theological questions. At first an opponent of the Lutheran heresies, this inconsistent prince of the Church showed later a suspicious inclination to patronize the advocates of the new system. Little by little the Archbishop, whose theological standpoint was hopelessly confused, found himself on a precipitous slope on which he entirely lost his footing. At the end of 1542 he summoned Bucer to Bonn and ordered his priests to administer the chalice to the laity and to preach Lutheran sermons. Although the Cathedral Chapter, the University, and the city clergy of Cologne held out manfully on behalf of the Catholic faith, Hermann persisted in his efforts to protestantize his diocese. In May 1543 Melancthon visited Bonn in person, and in July the secular Estates declared themselves in agreement with the Archbishop's course of action.²

At the same time it was rumoured that Francis von Waldeck, Bishop of Münster, Minden, and Osnabrück, was on the brink of apostasy. This prelate, prone to intemper-

¹ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III.,¹⁸ 528 *seqq.*, 538 *seq.*, 548 *seq.*, 561 *seq.*. See also KNIEB, *Gesch. der kath. Kirche in der freien Reichstadt Mühlhausen, Freiburg, 1907, 37 seq.*

² Cf. VARRENTRAPP, H. von Wied und sein Reformationsversuch in Köln, Leipzig, 1878; FLOSS and PASTOR in the *Annalen der Histor. Vereins für den Niederrhein, XXXVII., 121 seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III.,¹⁸ 562 *seq.*; POSTINA, Billick, 41 *seq.*; GULIK, Gropper, 44 *seq.*, 62 *seq.*, 86 *seqq.*; *Histor. Jahrb., XXVIII., 138 seq.*

ance and licentiousness, had for some length of time caused serious scandal in Catholic Westphalia by his personal conduct and his toleration of Protestant preaching. In the beginning of 1543 he solicited admission into the Schmalkaldic League.¹ The same step was taken by the Duke of Julier and Cleves, who since 1541 had been involved in war with the Emperor's sister, Maria, Regent of the Netherlands, on account of the succession to Guelders. William, who had been for long under the influence of Protestant-minded counsellors, promised the Schmalkaldic leaders that he would protestantize his states in return for their help against the Emperor. But since Philip of Hesse opposed the entrance of the Duke of Julier and Cleves into the League, the latter found himself alone when Charles appeared in the summer of 1543 with a greatly superior force. On the 24th of August, Düren, the chief stronghold of the duchy of Julier, was stormed and the entire country overcome. On September the 7th William appeared as suppliant at the feet of the Emperor in the camp of the latter at Venlo. Charles restored to his conquered enemy his ancient inheritance, but compelled him to renounce Guelders and Zutphen as well as his alliances with France and Denmark and also to cancel his introduction of religious innovations into his duchies.²

The overthrow of Duke William of Cleves had a decidedly reactionary effect on the development of affairs at Cologne. There the Emperor personally encouraged the Catholics to energetic resistance to the Archbishop's religious changes and insisted on Bucer's dismissal. Thereby the great danger threatening the Church on the lower Rhine was, if not indeed removed, yet substantially diminished.³

¹ See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III.,¹⁸ 560 *seq.*, and FISCHER, *Die Reformati-
onsversuche des Bischofs F. v. Waldeck. Dissert.*, Münster, 1906.

² See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III.,¹⁸ 570 *seq.* ³ Cf. GULIK, 97.

The Emperor's victory over the Duke of Cleves had, however, yet another important result: it opened Charles's eyes to the "weakness and political incapacity" of the Schmalkaldic group. He perceived, as he relates in his commentaries, that henceforward it was no longer simply impossible to curb their high spirit by force, but that this would be a very easy thing to do if only the attempt were made under suitable circumstances and with adequate means.¹ The Emperor's first requirement certainly was the unconditional support of all his subjects in his war against France, and thus the Schmalkaldic League had experienced once more a brilliant triumph at the Diet of Spires. Charles V., however, in his innermost heart disliked the concessions into which he had been coerced by the pressure of necessity; that he did not intend to adhere to them is shown by the secret clauses of the Peace of Crespy, by which Francis I. was pledged to give the Emperor support in restoring religious unity.² In this way the political situation was shifted in a manner favourable to the meeting of the Council.

Immediately after the conclusion of peace Charles V. and Francis conveyed through the nuncios accredited to their courts as well as through their ambassadors in Rome the expression of their wish that the Council should soon be opened at Trent.³ Before their messages had yet reached Rome⁴ Paul III., on his part, had already taken the initiative towards summoning the Council, now that the peace had cleared the way.

On the 29th of October 1544 Francesco Sfondrato, who had exchanged his former Bishopric of Sarno for the

¹ Commentaires, 101; BEZOLD, 746.

² Cf. *supra*, pp. 189, 200; see also BEZOLD, 747.

³ Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 15 *seq.*; EHSES, IV., 383, n. 1.

⁴ EHSES, IV., 381, n. 1.

Archiepiscopal See of Amalfi, was sent as nuncio-extraordinary to the Emperor¹ in order, in the first instance, to be the mouthpiece of the Pope's congratulations on the peace, but also to point out that one of the most important fruits of that peace was the possibility now opened of summoning and holding the Council. He was once more to represent to the Emperor all the efforts which the Pope had made to hold the Council up to its last suspension and the great necessity of holding the Synod, and then to announce that Paul III. now wished to remove the suspension and to enter upon the Council without delay. Therefore he besought his Majesty to co-operate with the Pope, especially by the despatch of the prelates of his Empire to Trent; the Emperor, on the other hand, ought to prevent the discussion of religious questions at the forthcoming Diet of Worms; no Legate also would represent the Pope in that assembly. With regard to the seat of the Council his Holiness was averse to any change of place, notwithstanding the inconveniences which had arisen at Trent and his own inability to proceed thither, as an alteration on this point would only give occasion for fresh difficulties and delays. On the 31st of October, Girolamo Dandino, with similar instructions, went as nuncio to the court of Francis I.²

On the 7th of November the French ambassador, George d'Armagnac, Bishop of Rodez, read aloud in consistory a letter of Francis I. of the 28th of October, in which, among other requests, he asked the Pope to open the Council within three months and certainly in Trent or

¹ His instructions, *ibid.*, 380-382. For his mission, *cf.* also MERKLE, I., 421, n. 5; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 8 *seq.* Contrary to Friedensburg's supposition that Sfondrato left in the first days of November, Ehses finds Oct. 29 as the date of his departure.

² *Cf.* EHSES, IV., 380, n. 1; Campana, 358.

the place that seemed most suitable to the Emperor and the King.¹ About the same time, after Sfondrato's departure, a letter was also received from the nuncio in France which, at the King's command, communicated in similar terms the position of the latter on the conciliar question; there was also a letter from Poggio announcing what Granvelle, in the Emperor's name, had pronounced on the matter.²

As soon as the Pope was assured of the agreement of the two sovereigns, on November the 14th the unanimous assent of all the Cardinals was given in consistory to the removal of the suspension of the Council and the fresh proclamation of the same on the 25th of March 1545.³ The final decision and the issue of the new Bull of summons took place in consistory on the 19th of November;⁴ in place of the 25th of March, as intended, the fourth Sunday in Lent, the 15th of March 1545, was fixed for the date of opening. In the same consistory Cardinals Cupis, del Monte, Carafa, Parisio, Cervini, Guidiccioni, Crescenzi, Cortese, Pole, together with Grimani and Morone, who were temporarily absent, were deputed to attend to the affairs of the Council.⁵ In a Bull also dated the 19th of

¹ Extract from the Consistorial Acts of Nov. 7, 1544, in EHSES, IV., 382 *seq.*

² *Cf.* Farnese's letter to Poggio of Nov. 14, 1544 (*ibid.*, 383, with n. 5). Francis I., however, was not, as later events showed, sincere, when in the period immediately after the conclusion of peace he displayed so much zeal for the Council (*cf. ibid.*, 384, n. 2; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 297).

³ Farnese reported on this to Poggio on Nov. 14, 1544 (EHSES, IV., 384 *seq.*), and to Morone on Nov. 17, 1544 (*ibid.*).

⁴ The text of the Bull "Laetare Hierusalem" of Nov. 19, 1544 (*ibid.*, 385-388). On the circumstance of the two decisions in the consistories of Nov. 14 and 19, *cf. ibid.*, 383 *seq.*, n. 6, with reference to Friedensburg's statement in Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 16.

⁵ Extract from the Consistorial Acts in EHSES, IV., 385.

November¹ Paul III. renewed his earlier decree on the Papal election in case his death during the Council should render such a measure necessary. The publication of the Bull of summons followed on the 30th of November.² On December the 3rd all bishops of all nationalities absent from Rome were summoned thither for the Epiphany.³

In a consistory on the 6th of February 1545 the following were appointed conciliar Legates: the Cardinal-Bishop Giovanni Maria del Monte, the Cardinal-Priest Marcello Cervini, and the Cardinal-Deacon Reginald Pole.⁴ On the 22nd of February the Legatine crosses⁵ were distributed, whereupon Cervini left Rome on the 23rd and del Monte on the 24th of February.⁶ Pole remained in Rome some time longer through fear of the machinations of Henry VIII., and rejoined the others later.⁷ The Bull

¹ EHSES, IV., 388 *seq.*

² EHSES, IV., 387. For the despatch of briefs to various princes partly before and partly after this date, *cf. ibid.*, 384, n. 1. For the history of the delivery of the Bulls to the Bishops by the metropolitans, *cf. ibid.*, 389 *seqq.*; here also is the mandate of the Bishop of Hildesheim, Valentine von Teutleben, of Jan. 12, 1545.

³ EHSES, IV., 384, n. 1. Cardinal E. Gonzaga, who hitherto had been the worst enemy of Paul III., thereupon thought it expedient to make peace with the Pope. For the Cardinal's own feelings, *cf. his* **letter to the Duke of Ferrara of Oct. 14, 1544; see E. Gonzaga's **letter to the Pope of Jan. 7, 1545, and **that of March 3 to Cardinal Farnese. Cod. Barb. lat., 5792, f. 112 *seq.*, 135 *seq.*, 143 (Vatican Library).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 394, n. 2; PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 8, n. 1; Massarelli, Diarium, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 422 *seq.*

⁵ Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 151; EHSES, IV., 394, n. 2.

⁶ Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 152; EHSES, IV., 394 *seq.*, n. 2.

⁷ Massarelli, Diarium, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 423; EHSES, IV., 395, n.; PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 8, n. 3.

of nomination for the Legates of the 22nd of February¹ was sent after them with another of the same date, empowering them, if the worst came to the worst, to hold the Council in some other city than Trent and to dissolve or continue it² at their own discretion. Not until the 27th of April was the brief, antedated at the wish of the Legates to the 10th of February, got ready. This gave them full powers to bestow an indulgence on their entry into Trent and on the opening of the Council.³ The two Legates who had left for Trent brought with them a brief of the 22nd of February for Cardinal Madruzzo of Trent⁴ in which he was directed to undertake the necessary preparations for the Council. On the 23rd of February Bishop Sanfelice of Cava was, as in September 1542, again sent to Trent⁵ to make arrangements for lodgments and commissariat. The secretary of the Council, Angelo Massarelli, had left Rome on the 23rd of February with the Legate Cervini, but was sent forward by the latter and reached Trent on the 6th of March, where he already found the Bishop of Cava.⁶ By a brief of the 6th of March⁷ the Legates were still further empowered to preside over the Council in twos or even singly if the others were absent or hindered.

The two Legates, Cervini and del Monte, reached Rovereto on the 12th of March and on the 13th made their solemn entry into Trent.⁸ Besides the Cardinal of Trent

¹ EHSES, IV., 393 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 395 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 391 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 396.

⁵ The brief in EHSES, IV., 397. The three following briefs also deal with reprovisionment (*ibid.*, 397 *seq.*).

⁶ For his journey and arrival, see his *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 152 *seqq.*

⁷ EHSES, IV., 398 *seq.*

⁸ Described in Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 159. Their letter to Farnese from Trent of March 13, in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 18 *seqq.*

and the Bishop of Cava they found no other prelates. On the 14th the Bishop of Feltre, Tommaso Campeggio, made his appearance.¹ Under these circumstances the Council could not be opened on the 15th.² On the 23rd of March the Imperial orator, Don Diego Hurtado da Mendoza,³ came, was received on the 26th in the house of Cardinal del Monte by the Legates in public audience, and received on the following day their answer.⁴ On the 8th of April the orators of King Ferdinand, Francesco de Castelalto and Antonio Quetta, presented themselves before the Legates.⁵

In the weeks supervening on the date of opening only a few more prelates appeared, among them the Bishop of Bitonto, Cornelio Mussi,⁶ and the Abbot Jean Loysier of Citeaux.⁷ In April a mandate of the viceroy of Naples, Pedro de Toledo, give occasion for counter-regulations.⁸ The latter had given orders that of the bishops of the

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 160; EHSES, IV., 399, n. 3.

² Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 160; *Diarium*, II., *ibid.*, I., 424; EHSES, IV., 399.

³ On Feb. 20 appointed orator and procurator of the Emperor to the Council (EHSES, IV., 392 *seq.*).

⁴ *Comparitio Ill. Dⁿⁱ Don Didaci de Mendocia oratoris Caesarei in sacro concilio Tridentino, 26 Martii, cum legatorum responsio, 27 Martii 1545* (EHSES, IV., 399-402); Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 161-165. *Cf.* the reports of the Legates to Farnese, of March 26, 27, and 30, of their negotiations with Mendoza in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 29 *seqq.*

⁵ Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 171 *seq.*; EHSES, IV., 408, n. 1. The mandate from King Ferdinand for the procurators was presented by them to the Legates on August 29 (EHSES, IV., 408 *seq.*).

⁶ Came on March 24 (Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 162).

⁷ Appeared with other Abbots of the Order before the Legates on April 12 (EHSES, IV., 403 *seq.*, and Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I. 173).

⁸ *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 10, n. 3, 4; EHSES, IV., 404-407.

Neapolitan kingdom only four, to be appointed by him, should go to the Council as procurators for the rest. The nuncio Poggio had already in March given notice of similar intentions on the Emperor's part with regard to the Spanish bishops.¹ The matter was all the more dangerous since Cardinals with Imperial leanings, such as Ercole Gonzaga, were dreaming of a deposition of the Pope by the Council after the manner of Basle.² In any case the freedom of the Council seemed to be threatened by the decrees of the Neapolitan viceroy, since the princes in this way might make themselves masters of the Council if it lay in their power to reduce hundreds of votes to those of a few of their satellites.³ The mandate of the viceroy led to the publication of the Bull of the 17th of April 1545⁴ by which the prelates were bound, save in cases of just impediment, to appear personally at the Council, and representation by procurators was forbidden.⁵

In the meantime the Imperial policy with regard to the Council had entered once more on its former tortuous path. In the proposition, presented by Ferdinand to the Estates at the Diet of Worms in the Emperor's name on the 24th of March 1545, the Council about to be held certainly was not passed over in silence, but on the other hand a promise was made that, in the event of the Council not having begun before the close of the existing Diet and

¹ Cf. EHSES, IV., 412 *seq.*, n. 6; see also Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 80, n. 2.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 210, n. 3, the Cardinal's hitherto unknown and very characteristic letter of Oct. 14, 1544. Cod. Barb. lat., 5792, f. 112 *seq.*, Vatican Library.

³ Cf. PALLAVICINI, *loc. cit.*, the letter of Bishop Corn. Mussi to Cardinal Santaflora from Trent of April 30, 1545 (EHSES, IV., 412 *seq.*).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 404-406.

⁵ In the case of the Germans the strict execution of this Bull was waived. Cf. *ibid.*, 404, n. 2.

taken in hand the work of reformation, the Emperor would summon afresh the Estates of the Empire, which would then enter upon the task of reform themselves.¹ In place of Verallo, transferred to the Imperial court, Fabio Mignanelli, Bishop of Lucera,² had been appointed permanent nuncio to Ferdinand. When he entered Worms on April the 2nd he was confronted by the difficult situation which the declaration in the Emperor's proposition had already caused. In his audience with Ferdinand on the 4th of April he received in reply to his official representations on the subject of the Council an evasively reassuring pronouncement, while Cardinal Otto von Truchsess of Augsburg, with whom he afterwards conversed, put before him with urgency³ the danger which threatened if the Council were not held at once. On the 7th Mignanelli visited Granvelle again, who was vehement in his complaints of the letter that had been sent to the Emperor. To Mignanelli's suggestion that it only contained fatherly admonitions, Granvelle replied that representations of that kind might certainly have been conveyed to his Majesty, but that the Bishop of Cava had no right to communicate the document to the Catholic princes; in this way the letter had been made known to the Protestants, who were on all sides circulating the most scurrilous refutations.⁴

The most passionate of these retorts had been written at the command of the Elector and Chancellor of Saxony

¹ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 387.

² The brief of credence (Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 81-83) contained a request that Ferdinand should take steps to inform the Council of the nature of any discussions which might arise at the Diet of Worms on the question of religion. For the mission of Mignanelli, cf. Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 27 *seq.*

³ Mignanelli to Farnese, dat. April 4, 1545; Nuntiatürberichte, 89 *seq.*; DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 34 *seq.*

⁴ Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 96 *seqq.*

by the originator of the religious disruption, now standing on the verge of the grave. This was the pamphlet which appeared in March 1545 "against the Papacy in Rome, founded by the Devil," the most violent effusion of Luther's pen. The chief ruler of the Church is here spoken of with wearisome iteration as "the most all-hellish father," "his Hellishness," and styled "Juggler," "the Ass Pope with long asses' ears," "desperate knave," "the destroyer of Christianity," "Satan's bodily dwelling-place," "the Devil's apostle," "the author and master of all sins," "Roman Hermaphrodite" and "Pope of Sodomites." By means of a Council the Pope and his followers could not be made better: "Since they believe that there is neither God nor hell nor a life after this life, but live and die like cow, sow, or any other cattle, it is indeed laughable that they should hold seal or brief or reformation. Therefore this were best; let the Emperor and the Estates of the Empire tell the vicious, scandalous knaves and the cursed dregs of the devil at Rome to go to hell for ever; yet there is no hope there that any good will be gained. We must work in other ways. Nothing was ever set right by Councils." What, however, ought to be done to extirpate "the devil-founded Papacy," Luther tells us in the words: "Fall to now, Emperor, King, Princes, Lords, and whoever will fall to along with you. God brings no luck here to idle hands. And first of all take from the Pope, Rome, Romandiol, Urbin, Bononia, and all that he has as a Pope; for he has with lies and tricks—ah! what say I, lies and tricks!—he has with blasphemies and idolatry shamefully filched, robbed, and robbed from the Empire and trampled them under foot, and therefore has he led to their reward in the eternal fire of hell countless souls through his idolatry and destroyed Christ's kingdom, wherefore he is called an abomination of desolation. Therefore ought he,

the Pope himself, his Cardinals and all the rabble of his idolatry and Papal holiness, to be taken and as blasphemers have their tongues torn out from the back of their necks and nailed in rows on the gallows just as they attach their seals in rows to their Bulls. Yet what a trifle is this compared to their blasphemy and idolatry! Therefore let them hold one Council, or as many as they please, on the gallows in hell, deep below all devils."

The contents of Luther's scurrilous libel correspond with the frontispiece, which represents the Pope on his throne in priestly robes but having asses' ears and surrounded by devils, who are crowning him from above with a scavenger's bucket and from below are dragging him down to hell.¹

At the same time Calvin composed, in the form of forty-seven scholia on the Papal letter, a violent pamphlet against Paul III.² Johann Sleidan, once a French spy, afterwards the historian of the Schmalkaldic League, published two addresses to the Emperor and the Empire in which he called for measures of force against the Pope, who is identified with Antichrist.³

Undisturbed by the indignation displayed by the

¹ Cf. JANSSEN, Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker, 99 *seq.*; EHSSES, IV., 373, n. 4.

² Admonitio paterna Pauli III. R. P. ad invicta Caes. Carolum V. . . . cum scholiis, 1545 (*cf.* DRUFFEL, Karl V., I., 80 *seq.*). Although Druffel says of Calvin's scholia, "They are in many places not merely sharp and incisive but coarse and foul," he yet in many respects makes himself the accomplice of the Genevan reformer and discharges the latter's scholia like barbed arrows against Paul III. and previous Popes. Ehses retorts in the Wissenschaftlichen Beilage zur Germania, 1900, No. 16, and in Conc. Trid., IV. 373, that Calvin in matters of exact knowledge is not the man behind whom an historical inquirer of the present day ought to take shelter (see also MERKLE, I., 174, n. 4).

³ SLEIDANUS, Zwei Reden, neu herausgegeben von E. Böhmer, Tübingen, 1879; *cf.* JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 591 *seq.*

Catholics and even the Emperor at the scandalous writings of Sleidan and Luther, the Protestants had these and other poisonous pamphlets and vulgar caricatures of the Pope distributed in the Diet. These proceedings, as well as their unconditional rejection of the Council, show how powerful they already felt themselves to be.¹ The situation was made worse by many on the Catholic side casting doubts on the sincerity of the curial efforts to bring about the Council.² To the remonstrances of Granvelle, who, opposed to the nuncio in this respect, had also called attention to the fact that since the notification of the resumption of the Council no further communications on the progress of affairs had been made to the Imperial ambassador on the side of the Pope, Mignanelli replied that Paul III. testified by his action that he wished for the Council, but in his report he gave a warning that the Curia had better make up for lost time. Mignanelli also instructed the Legates in Trent on the state of things in Worms; a letter from him in cipher full of details was sent on to Rome by the Legates on the 23rd of April.³

Mignanelli's reports, a warning letter from Cardinal Truchsess, and the advice of Cardinal Madruzzo were decisive in determining the Pope to yield to the earnest desires of Charles and to send Cardinal Farnese to Worms.⁴

¹ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, 590, 592; DRUSSEL-BRANDI, 75; Nuntiattriberichte, VIII., 98, n. 101, n. 4. See also WENDELER, Luthers Bilderpolemik gegen das Papstum: Archiv für Literaturgesch., XIV., 16 *seqq.*

² Mignanelli to Farnese, dat. April 9, 1545; Nuntiattriberichte, VIII., 98 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, Karl V., I., 41 *seq.*

³ Nuntiattriberichte, VIII., 99 *seq.*; cf. MERKLE, I., 178.

⁴ Nuntiattriberichte, VIII., 28, 106, n. 3. For Madruzzo's advice, see in Appendix No. 24 Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letter of March 28, 1545 (Vatican Library).

After Paul III., in a consistory held on the 14th of April had given fuller information to the Cardinals concerning this important mission, Alessandro left Rome on the 17th. So that no attention should be excited in Germany, he was attended only by a small suite.¹ After Farnese's departure a letter reached Rome from the conciliar Legates in which they fully set forth that the very imminent danger of a national council in Germany in consequence of the proposition of the Diet, made the early inauguration of the Council at Trent necessary, in any case before the close of the Imperial Diet.² Paul III. thereupon on the 23rd, and once more on the 27th of April, caused instructions to be sent to the Legates to open the Council on the 3rd of May 1545, the Feast of the Invention of the Cross. Out of consideration for Farnese's mission the command was not made absolute, but left the Legates at liberty to postpone the opening in case during the interval further information should come from Worms which would seem to make this expedient.³

Cardinal Farnese travelled very quickly. On the 21st of April he was already in Bologna,⁴ and on the 23rd in Mantua, where the Regent, Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, discussed with him among other matters the failing strength of the Pope.⁵ The same evening the Legate hastened on to Peschiera, whence a ship belonging to Cardinal Madruzzo conveyed

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 107, n. ; *cf.* CAMPANA, 480.

² See DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 55 *seqq.* *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 10, n. 5-8 ; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 122, n. 2.

³ EHSES, IV., 411 ; DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 65.

⁴ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 120, n. 1.

⁵ *Cf.* in App. No. 25 Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letter of April 26, 1545 (Vatican Library). San Benedetto, which the Cardinal touched on his journey and which Friedensburg (Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 120) cannot identify, is the Abbey of S. Benedetto di Polirone near Mantua.

him to Riva. There the latter Cardinal and his two Legatine colleagues awaited him and in their company he entered Trent on the 25th.¹ Just as he was on the point of setting forth again on the 28th of April the order for the opening of the Council reached the Legates. Farnese, however, was successful in persuading the latter of the necessity of deferring this event until he had had speech with the Emperor. Since Mendoza also and the Cardinal of Trent were in agreement with Farnese, the Legates followed their advice and reported on the matter on the same day to Cardinals Santaflora, Cervini, and Morone.² Farnese also at the very moment of departure wrote to the Pope upon the subject.³

On May the 3rd the Legates called the ten bishops,⁴ who up till then had appeared in Trent, to a meeting and communicated to them the Papal orders and their reasons for temporary delay, on which all were agreed.⁵ The Pope ordered Cardinal Santaflora to write⁶ to the Legates on the 4th of May with his approval of the postponement, but on the 21st communicated to them instructions that as soon as they were informed from Worms of the Emperor's

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 120 *seq.*; Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 179.

² Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 180, under date of April 28; DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 66 *seq.*, 68 *seq.* Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 11, n. 4, 5.

³ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 133, n. 1.

⁴ They were the Bishops of Cava, Feltre, Cadix, Pesaro, Piacenza, Accia, Majorca, Bitonto, Belcastro, and Bertinoro.

⁵ The accounts of this assembly in Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 183, and in EHSES, IV., 413. Letter of the Legates to Santaflora of May 4 in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 80 *seq.* A memorial of the Bishop of Feltre on the question of the opening of the Council and other matters brought before the Bishops by the Legates in the assembly of May 3, in EHSES, IV., 414-417.

⁶ DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 82 *seq.*

consent to the opening of the Council they were to proceed thereto without delay and without waiting for a fresh Papal mandate.¹ That the Pope at this time assumed that there would be only a short interval of delay is proved by the fact that on the 9th of May he had instructions sent by Cardinal Santaflora to the nuncio in France to urge Francis I. to send the prelates of his kingdom to the Council at the earliest possible moment.²

Cardinal Farnese reached Brixen on the evening of the 29th of April 1545. There he met Bellagais, the secretary of Cardinal Truchsess, who assured him that King Ferdinand, Granvelle, and the Catholics hailed his appearance at Worms with great joy. A message received from Verallo, that the Emperor had rescinded the order forbidding the Cardinals nominated on the 17th of December 1544 to assume the insignia of their new dignities,³ also helped to dissipate any misgivings as to the reception that awaited Farnese from Charles and Ferdinand.

The Cardinal's further progress was not without anxieties owing to the danger of his seizure in a Protestant ambush. On the advice of Cardinal Truchsess, who had sent his only brother to meet him, he abandoned the usual post-roads on foot and did not touch Augsburg. In the course of his journey Farnese fell in with Niccolò Madruzzo, brother of the Cardinal of Trent, who was to accompany him until he reached Worms. In Dillingen, which he

¹ EHSES, IV., 413, n. 3.

² *Ibid.* On April 29, 1545, this nuncio, Alessandro Guidiccioni, reported to Farnese that Francis I. had declared to him that before he sent his Bishops to the Council he would await the outcome of the Diet of Worms (*ibid.*, 412). The third conciliar Legate, Pole, entered Trent on May 4 (see Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 183 *seq.*; EHSES, IV., 395, 419).

³ *Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 133 *seq.*

reached on the 5th of May, the Legate found awaiting him a messenger from Cardinal Truchsess with urgent entreaties to suspend the journey as the Protestant Duke of Wurtemberg was not to be trusted. Farnese and his companion were burning with impatience to advance, and the Legate thought for a moment of braving the dangers and passing through the Protestant Duchy in disguise, but on further consideration he decided to choose the safer course and to go round the zone of danger. Therefore, under sufficient protection, with a guide of King Ferdinand, he made his way by Ulm, Scheer, Donaueschingen, and Freiburg to Spires and thence to Worms.¹

When in Ulm the Cardinal had an opportunity of catching a glimpse of the Protestant world. The noble minster of that city he found to be in the interior "as white as a mosque," with a bare, undecorated altar. The desolation of this House of God, "as empty as a barber's basin," had a profoundly depressing effect on the Cardinal and his company. What a difference between this and the churches of Italy, richly adorned with works of art! Farnese, who naturally did not disclose himself, visited the booksellers' shops in Worms and found there only Protestant works. On this occasion he plunged with great boldness into religious discussion. On his representing that no one had a right to leave the old secure path at the bidding of a private person guided by his own passions, he was met with the rejoinder that no one should have any other guide than the clear words of Holy Scripture; they were perfectly sufficient, wherefore a Council was unnecessary. The animated counter-propositions of the Cardinal were without effect. He had shown so much eagerness on this occasion that his companions urged him to use greater caution in

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, 139 *seqq.*; KANNENGIESSER, 54, 123 *seq.*; DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 80, 83, 85, 91

the future; nevertheless, the Cardinal soon afterwards was holding discussions, in Catholic places, it must be said, and on more than one occasion with a lettered member of the Protestant community.¹

When Farnese entered Worms on the 17th of May he had already been preceded by Charles V. The delay caused by the Legate's circuitous journey had one good result; his appearance in Worms could be accounted for simply as bearing on the Diet and the subsidy required for the Turkish war.

Farnese's audience with the Emperor took place on the 18th of May. Charles made open display of his Catholic sentiments; he met, hat in hand, the Pope's representative in the foremost reception chamber, and when the latter withdrew, the Emperor reconducted him, in the same manner, to the door. The reception generally was such that in Farnese's opinion he had never before been greeted so well as on this occasion. Even if Charles V. did not disguise a certain dryness and firmness of demeanour, yet, when Farnese touched in a tone of apology on former misunderstandings, he remarked that it would be better to let bygones be bygones and turn over a new page. Further, the Emperor assured him of his determination to give his protection to the Holy See and the house of Farnese. The Legate's second mandate, like the first, met with the best reception. The Emperor offered a subsidy of 100,000 ducats for the Turkish war, to be deposited for that purpose in Augsburg. Farnese's third request was that Charles should support the Council by ordering his bishops to participate in it, and that he should put a stop to the attempt of the viceroy of Naples to substitute a small representative body for the collective episcopate of that kingdom and prohibit such attempts

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 149 *seq.*

in other parts of the Empire. To this Charles V. gave an evasive answer.¹

Further transactions were carried on by Granvelle, who certainly praised the Pope's decision to open the Council, but pointed with emphasis to the danger with which this step was coupled—the danger of the Protestants then breaking up the Diet, of a massacre of Catholics in Germany, even of a vindictive enterprise against Rome itself; the Emperor alone could make but a feeble resistance against such an attack, if the German Catholics could not be counted on. All depended on the help of the Pope.

The Cardinal was amazed at these announcements. That the Emperor, whose illicit concessions to the Protestants in former years had drawn from the Pope the most serious remonstrances, should now be seeking an alliance with Rome to compass the forcible suppression of these very Protestants, seemed to him at first incredible. The cool treatment of the affairs of the Council, as well as the sudden announcement of the Emperor's extreme fear of the Protestants, aroused strong suspicion in the Cardinal. He rejoined that the task of getting the better of their opponents lay in the first instance with the Emperor, but that financial support from Paul III. towards their chastisement was not excluded. That the Emperor was really in earnest in the matter seemed to the Cardinal at first to be highly doubtful. His surmise was that Charles in reality would go no further than to extract as much money as

¹ See Farnese to the Pope and the conciliar Legates, dat. Worms, May 22, 1545, in DRUFFEL, Karl V., II., 57 *seq.*; III., 62 *seq.*, and in the Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 160 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 158 *seq.* Also a report of May 21 on the first impressions. (In FRIEDENSBURG, p. 159, line 10, for "chiesino" marked by a "sic" read "chietino"; it is a term for a pious man.) Cf. in Appendix No. 26 Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letter of June 4, 1545 (Vatican Library).

possible from the Pope under the pretext of a war against the Protestants and then, indifferent to the interests of the Holy See, would, as he had done before, come to some accommodation with the Protestant Estates against levying the Turkish subsidy.¹

In the course of the negotiations, however, this misgiving vanished. Farnese became convinced that the Emperor's plan of armed aggression on the Protestant Estates was seriously meant, and that his endeavours to put off the Council were only a feint to enable the opening to take place with all the greater prestige. The Emperor's proposal to use force against the Protestants with the Pope as his ally would rouse not merely an expectation of the restoration in Germany of the deeply injured Catholic Church, but also a hope that Charles would uphold the Papal authority against that of the Church assemblies instead of making himself, as was feared, the champion of the movements aimed at the limitation of the Papal power. Moreover, there was the prospect of the union between Emperor and Pope being also of the greatest advantage to the exaltation of the house of Farnese.²

The nuncios at Worms, Mignanelli and Dandino, could find nothing sufficiently favourable to say in their reports to Rome of the tact and sagacity displayed by the Cardinal-Legate during the negotiations. Both held the view that the Pope under all circumstances must agree with the Emperor's plan that they should make common cause in warfare against the Protestants.³ Even Farnese

¹ Thus of May 22, 1545, to the Pope (see DRUFFEL, Karl V., II., 57 ; cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 12).

² See Farnese's letter to the Pope of May 22, 1545, in DRUFFEL, II., 57 *seq.* ; cf. KANNENGIESSER, 58, and the same in the *Festschrift* (217 *seq.*) of the Protestant Gymnasium at Strasbourg (1888).

³ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 169 *seq.*

was of this opinion, but without definite instructions on this entirely unexpected proposal, without powers to enter into so weighty and far-reaching a scheme, he could only give the general assurance that the Pope would support with all his might an undertaking of such importance to the Church.¹ In order by his personal mediation to bring to a conclusion so promising a compact between the heads of the Church and Empire as well as to keep his great secret safe, he resolved to return with all speed to Rome. He and his companion Aliprando Madruzzo put on German clothes in order to keep up their incognito and to escape the machinations of the Protestants, whose suspicions were now aroused. In the stormy night between the 27th and 28th of May the Cardinal left Worms.² By the 2nd of June they were in Trent, where he reported to the Legates the success of his mission with regard to the Council,³ and on the evening of the 8th of June he rode into Rome.⁴

Cardinal Farnese brought with him an autograph letter from the Emperor in which he announced that he had come to a complete understanding with the Legate and prayed his Holiness to come to an early decision.⁵ Paul III. at once resolved to accept the Emperor's offers. After discussing the important situation with the Cardinals, he declared himself prepared to give extensive help. He would pledge himself to bank at Venice 100,000 ducats in addition to the same amount deposited by Farnese

¹ He seems to have gone pretty far in this respect (see KANNENGIESSER, 58 *seq.*).

² Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 181.

³ Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 198-200; ESHES, IV., 422.

⁴ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 37, 198; CAMPANA, 482.

⁵ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 183, n. 1.

at Augsburg; 12,000 Italian infantry and 500 light horse were to be maintained at his cost for four months; besides, the half-year's income of the Spanish Church, amounting to 400,000 ducats, would be assigned and permission given for the sale of the holdings of Spanish convents, which would be compensated in other ways, to the amount of 500,000 ducats. The Pope was also inclined to acquiesce in the postponement of the opening of the Council. On the other hand, he demanded that the money contributed should be spent exclusively on the operations against the Protestant Estates, and that no agreement should be concluded with the latter to which the Pope and Emperor were not both parties. By the 17th of June Farnese was able to communicate these offers to Granvelle. The day before he had written to Charles V. that the Pope's firm determination to place all his power at the Emperor's disposal had filled him with greater joy than he had ever experienced before.¹

Paul III. then ordered preparations for war to be made on a vast scale, the objects of which could not be doubted.² The courier despatched on the 16th of June with the offers to the Emperor must have travelled with such extraordinary speed that on the 23rd he reached Worms.³ Evidently the hammer was to strike while the iron was hot.⁴

The Emperor was all the more delighted with the Pope's

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 37, 198 *seqq.*

² Besides DRUFFEL, Karl V., II., 25, *cf.* in Appendix No. 27 the *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga of June 30, 1545 (Vatican Library).

³ See DRUFFEL, II., 25; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 198 *seq.*, 204, 664, 665; MERKLE, I., 207, 221.

⁴ All decisions were suspended until the Emperor's return; see *H. Tiranno, letter from Rome on June 27, 1545, to Urbino (State Archives, Florence).

offer as he was in expectation of soon having yet another 100,000 ducats, making 300,000 in all. He promised to expend the Papal contributions only against the Protestants and not to make any terms with them to which the Pope was not also a party. The war itself he intended to begin in the course of the year.¹

As on the 27th and 28th of June so also on the 1st and 2nd July the nuncios were still able to report that Charles was occupied in the preparations for the campaign and seeking to form an alliance with Duke William of Bavaria, and to lull the suspicions of the Protestants by making arrangements for a religious conference. But already on July the 4th the nuncios received an intimation that difficulties had sprung up which might cause the war to be put off until the following year.²

The more the Emperor pondered over the state of affairs the more doubtful it seemed to be that a speedy beginning of the war was possible. Although a considerable time had passed by he was still hoping for the available ready money. In addition to this the negotiations with Bavaria, contrary to expectation, were not proceeding favourably.³ The Emperor's fears were increased by Ferdinand and Granvelle, so that on the 5th of July the postponement of the undertaking was a settled affair. On the following day the High Steward of the Empire, Johann von Andelot, left Worms in order to lay before the Pope by word of mouth the changed condition of things.⁴

Andelot had an audience on the 15th of July. He first of all set forth the reasons which had compelled the Emperor to defer the war until the next year; in the mean-

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 38.

² *Ibid.*, 226 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁴ Cf. KANNENGIESSER, 63; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 227, n.

time measures might be considered for supporting the Catholics against the attacks of the Protestants, and a written agreement drawn up determining the shares in the burden of war to be borne by the Emperor and the Pope. In the second place, Andelot begged that the opening of the Council might not be premature; in any case, that the Emperor should have previous intimation so that by withdrawal from Worms he might escape the dangers threatening him from the Protestant side. Andelot pressed his requests further: that the Council after its opening should at once occupy itself with reform and not with dogma. He also asked for the Pope's consent that the Emperor should keep the Protestants in check by holding a religious conference and summoning a new Diet for the winter at which he promised to avoid any encroachments on the authority of the Holy See. Finally, Paul III. was asked to take steps against the Archbishop of Cologne, who might prove a serious obstacle to the Emperor's plans.¹

The Pope, who from the Emperor's communications to Farnese and his lavish offers had become firmly convinced the outbreak of war was close at hand, was painfully surprised by Andelot's announcement; nevertheless, his reply was as accommodating as was possible. He was ready for war at any moment, but submitted to the more competent judgment of the Emperor with regard to its commencement. He was prepared to conclude an agreement on the basis of his existing offers. The opening of the Council, which he would gladly notify to Charles, did not admit of longer delay, but the proceedings would be such that the cause of religion and the war against the Protestants would derive advantage and not prejudice

¹ Cf. Farnese's report of July 19, 1545, in DRUFFEL, II., 72 *seq.*, and still more correctly in Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 249 *seq.*

from them. The best help the Catholics could have would be the continued presence of Charles in Upper Germany. The Pope on his side would, under any circumstances, continue to give them his protection; he was also willing to take summary measures against the Archbishop of Cologne even to the length of deposition.¹

Whilst acceding to the latest wishes of the Emperor, Paul III. had hopes that the latter would raise no objections to the plan which he had long been maturing of conferring upon Pier Luigi Farnese the fiefs of Parma and Piacenza. This matter had already been a subject of conversation during Cardinal Farnese's sojourn in Worms.² Charles V. would have preferred to see the above-named cities bestowed upon his son-in-law, Ottavio Farnese. But this did not suit the views of Pier Luigi; he himself must be the master of those fertile territories. It was represented to the Pope that Parma and Piacenza were in constant danger of being lost in war, and their only security was the government of a prince with undisputed authority. Still the Pope hesitated before taking the final step. Pier Luigi therefore sent to Rome his confidential secretary, Apollonio Filareto. The eloquent representations of this

¹ The nuncio Verallo was more thoroughly instructed by Farnese (see letter of July 19, 1545, mentioned in preceding note) to represent at court, opportunely and tactfully, that the treatment of questions of the Faith, as the primary cause of the summoning of the Council, could not be shelved. On July 26 Verallo had an audience of the Emperor in which he acted simply in accordance with Farnese's letter and received from Charles in reference to the Council the reply that he was satisfied with the opening of the Council, but only wished it could be deferred until the Assumption (Aug. 15) or Nativity (Sept. 8) of our Lady (Verallo and Mignanelli to Farnese, dat. Aug. 3, 1545, in *Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 265).

² See AFFÒ, Pier Luigi Farnese, 69 *seq.*; *Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 42.

agent were at last successful, in the beginning of August, in allaying the lingering scruples of the Pope.¹

Nothing now remained but to win the consent of the Sacred College. This Cardinals Farnese and Gambara undertook to do, the latter having been from the beginning a warm partisan of Pier Luigi. Everything seemed to be settled, and on the 7th of August a final vote was to be taken in consistory. Then on the evening of the 6th, just as the Pope was retiring to rest, Andelot and Marquina appeared on the scene with the announcement that the Emperor gave his consent only to the investiture of Ottavio. When Paul III. opposed his firm determination not to relinquish the cause of Pier Luigi, the representatives of Charles gave way to the length of assuring him that they would allow the case to proceed in silent acquiescence.²

But in the College of Cardinals an objection sprang up. Here undoubtedly the ambitious Ottavio had cards to play. On the 12th of August the Pope in person brought the subject before the consistory. He pointed out that the two cities were far too responsible and far too costly a possession for the Holy See, he therefore conveyed them to Pier Luigi and his heirs as fiefs in return for a yearly tribute of 9000 ducats. Pier Luigi was in a position to uphold these cities and to give to the Holy See in compensation Camerino and Nepi, the latter places, on account of their situation, being much more important and profitable, so that in the end their acquisition would be a gain. The opponents were, naturally, not satisfied with such flimsy arguments; they wished to know whether the Pope, who was only the trustee of the Papal States, had any right to alienate portions of their territory. The opposition was so

¹ See AFFÒ, 71 *seqq.*; *cf.* NAVENNE in Rev. Hist., LXXVIII., 13 *seq.*

² See A. Filareto's report of Aug. 6, 1545, in AFFÒ, 76 *seq.*

vehement that the Cardinals came to no conclusion.¹ In a second consistory on the 19th of August the treasurer produced accounts which showed that the yearly net income of Parma and Piacenza only amounted to 7339 ducats, while those of Camerino and Nepi reached 10,375; besides, the fortification and garrisoning of Parma and Piacenza during the existing pontificate had amounted to over 200,000 ducats.² But even these figures did not convince the opposition. The Pope in his financial estimates might not be altogether at fault, yet the fact stared them in the face that a small hill-town like Camerino and a place as paltry as Nepi could not be looked upon as more than an equivalent for such prosperous and wealthy cities as Parma and Piacenza.³ The jest that the Farnese intended to take a closet (Camerino) in exchange for two stately chambers was not unjustified.⁴

The strongest opposition came from Cardinals Cupis and Juan Alvarez de Toledo, Archbishop of Burgos. Pisani, Carpi, and Sadoletto also spoke against the project, but submitted their opinion to the superior judgment of the Pope. Trivulzio, Armagnac, and Carafa were far away from the consistory, so that the final decision lay with only a small group in the Sacred College.⁵

¹ See *Acta Consist. in Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 289, n. 1, and *Massarelli, Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 244 *seq.*

² See **Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican)*; *cf. Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 290, n. 1.

³ See in Appendix No. 28 the opinion of Cardinal E. Gonzaga in his *letter of August 18, 1545 (Vatican Library).

⁴ The reasons adduced by MANENTE (p. 293) in excuse of Paul III. are not sound, but explicable in a work dedicated to Duke Alessandro Farnese.

⁵ *Cf. *Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican)*; PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 14; AFFÒ, 83 *seq.*; MERKLE, I., 261. See also the **Vita di Paolo III. in Cod. Bolognetti*, 209, f. 114^b *seq.* of the

A Bull, antedated the 26th of August, decreed the incorporation of Camerino and Nepi into the States of the Church and the investiture of Pier Luigi with Parma and Piacenza, these cities being erected into a Duchy.¹ Ottavio was compensated for the loss of Camerino and Nepi by the Dukedom of Castro; the Prefecture of Rome fell to the lot of Orazio Farnese.²

The scandalous unconcern with which Paul III. indulged his nepotistic instincts on this occasion was shown by the fact that the famous Alessandro Cesati was ordered to strike a medal the obverse of which represented the naked Ganymede supported by the Olympian eagle in the act of watering the Farnese lily.³

The new allocation of territory brought with it a change in the jurisdiction of the Papal States. A new Legation was formed comprising Camerino, Spoleto, Terni, Narni, and Rieti. This Umbrian Legation was bestowed on Cardinal Durante, while Assisi and Città di Castello were transferred to the Legation of Perugia.⁴

Secret Archives of the Vatican. The speeches here given are not authentic, as BOTTA (*Storia d' Italia*, II., 109) supposes; on the other hand, it is quite correct that N. Ardinghella entered into the scheme.

¹ The question was not finally settled until the end of 1545 (see AFFÒ, 89; *Histor. Jahrb.*, XXIV., 520; GUALANO, 71 *seq.*; MASSIGNAN, 58, and *Istoria del dom. temp. d. sede ap. nel ducato di Parma e Piacenza*, Roma, 1720, 353 *seq.*).

² Cf. NAVENNE in *Rev. Hist.*, LXXVIII., 17 *seq.*; for the cession of Camerino, see LILI, 344 *seq.*

³ See ARMAND, I., 172. A fine specimen of the medal in the Museum of Parma (see *Atti Mod.*, II., 256, n. 6). Paul III.'s nepotism was so great that in October 1545 many persons believed "che il papa cerchi di lassarsi un successore" (Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 290). In August 1546 it was reported that Sfondrato had been selected; see LUZIO, V. Colonna, 49 *seq.*, and Lupo Gentile, *Farnesiana*, Sarzana, 1906, 10 (*Nozze-Publ.*).

⁴ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 290, n.

While the courtiers were heaping congratulations on the new Duke of Parma and Piacenza and throwing out hopes for the acquisition of Milan,¹ the opposition were enraged at the success of Paul III. in surmounting so many obstacles. In a letter of the 23rd of August 1545 to the Duke of Ferrara, Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga gave expression to his bitter scorn of the "dear old man" who was about to raise the new Duke to the thrones of France and Spain, and indeed of the whole world. "To us scions of ancient princely houses, whose heritage was won by so much effort and is with such difficulty maintained, it seems strange indeed that so new a prince should spring up like a mushroom in the night."² Carafa gave nobler expression to his deep repugnance to this latest act of nepotism to which Paul III. had yielded, to the injury of the Church and the temporal power. On the day of the consistory, apparently with deliberate intention, he made a pilgrimage to the seven principal churches of Rome.³

In the face of this arbitrary proceeding of the Pope's, the Emperor found his hands tied by a twofold knot. On the 27th of August his daughter Margaret had at last borne the longed-for offspring of her marriage with Ottavio Farnese. It did not therefore become Charles V. to protest against a decree which opened up the prospect of a Duchy for his own grandson. But a still more decisive motive for silence lay in the plan of war against his Protestant subjects, towards which the Pope's help was

¹ AFFÒ, 85, who sees in this evidence of Farnese aspirations to Milan. See also BROSCHE, I., 182, on this point.

² See text of the *letter in Appendix No. 29; *cf.* also the very characteristic **letters of the Cardinal of Aug. 31 and Sept. 5, 1545 (Vatican Library, *loc. cit.*).

³ See CARACCIOLO, *Vita di Paolo IV. (Casanatense Library, Rome); BROMATO, II., 121 *seq.*

indispensable. He therefore accepted the accomplished fact without expressing approval or the reverse.¹ Nevertheless, the relations of the Pope and the Emperor continued for some time to come to be anything but satisfactory.

The Recess of the Diet of Worms of the 4th of August 1545, which entirely ignored Council and Pope and promised a religious conference, continued, in spite of the tranquillizing assurances of Andelot and Vega, to be as much as ever an object of mistrust and anxiety² to the Papal party. There was, further, the difference of standpoint from which the question of the Council was regarded. This became apparent when Juan de Vega made excuses for the Recess to the Pope and at the same time requested that the Council should remain suspended throughout the whole of September, and that also subsequently, after the opening had taken place, no decisions on questions of faith should be declared, but that the transactions of the Council should be confined to disciplinary matters.³ Upon this Paul III. turned the discussion to the question of the transference of the Council, which had for so long claimed attention.⁴ As the ambassadors announced that

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 44.

² *Ibid.*, 44, 45.

³ Farnese reported on this to the Legates on Aug. 26, 1545 (DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 180 *seq.* ; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 15, n. 2).

⁴ The question of transference was also discussed in Trent where, in consequence of the prolonged uncertainty whether or where the Council would be opened, the position was an uncomfortable one. On June 7 the Legates had already written to Farnese, in the memorials requested from them, on the question of a transference and had observed that if this became a matter of discussion the Emperor's wishes would have first of all to be considered (Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 194, 195). Pietro Bertano, Bishop of Fano, repeatedly laid before Farnese his opinion that the Council ought to be transferred to a place agreeable to the Pope: Trent, July 3, 1545 (*ibid.*, 640 *seqq.*), July 12, 1545

they had no powers to deal with this point, Girolamo Dandino, Bishop of Caserta, was sent¹ as nuncio-extraordinary to the Emperor's court in order to obtain clear information as to Charles's intention in this respect as well as in regard to the war against the Protestants.

According to Dandino's instructions² dated the 13th of September 1545, he was to propose to the Emperor in the name of Paul III. that the Council should be no longer deferred, as Charles out of consideration for his plan of campaign desired, but opened at once, but in some place more convenient for the bishops of all nations, as well as for the Pope and Emperor, than Trent with its numerous disadvantages. In opposing the reasons adduced in favour of a transference to Italy, the predominant consideration that weighed for Trent, its suitability for the Germans, was no longer taken into account, since the Protestants expressly declined to appear wherever the Council might be held and the German Catholics also stayed away on the plea that, owing to the existing state of disturbance, they could not desert their churches. If the nuncio saw any inclination on the Emperor's part he was as far as possible to secure his consent to the choice of a new place being left entirely to the Pope ; but if Charles wished the Pope

(EHSES, IV., 427, n. 1), again on Oct. 5 (Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 648 *seqq.*). Farnese on July 13 and 14 ordered the Legates to send a written opinion on an eventual transference (DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 153). Through Lodovico Beccadelli the Legates made proposals to the Pope and Cardinal Farnese on the question in August (the instructions to Beccadelli of Aug. 13 in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 171 *seqq.*). On July 14 the Cardinal of Trent, writing to the Legates from Brixen, said that he thought that the transference should be brought about through the Emperor's influence on the Pope (*ibid.*, 154 *seq.*).

¹ For Dandino's mission, *cf.* Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 314 *seqq.* ; EHSES, IV., 430, n. 1 ; PIEPER, 145.

² In EHSES, IV., 430-432.

to make some specific suggestion, then Bologna was to be recommended.

Dandino, accompanied by Marquina, secretary to the Imperial ambassador Vega, reached the Emperor's court at Brussels on the 3rd of October. On the 4th he laid his instructions before the Emperor,¹ who at once declared his objection to a transference, an objection which was renewed on the pursuance of the negotiations by the regent Figueroa and the Imperial secretary Idiaquez.² On the 7th the nuncios Verallo and Dandino had another audience of the Emperor in which the latter went more thoroughly into his reasons for opposing the transference.³ On the 10th the Emperor handed to the nuncios the written reply to be communicated to the Pope.⁴ Therein he stated fully the grounds of his refusal, but on the other hand agreed to an immediate opening of the Council by the Pope, although he wished that at first there should be no discussion of the Protestant heresy. On the 19th Marquina, bearing the Emperor's reply to the Pope, reached Trent on his journey to Rome and handed to the Legates letters from Verallo and Dandino containing fuller information concerning the Emperor's position.⁵ On the same day the Legates wrote to Farnese and the Pope.⁶ They protested strongly against the Emperor's demand that the Council should deal only with reform and throw

¹ Dandino to Farnese from Brussels, dat. Oct. 5, 1545 (Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 317 *seqq.*).

² *Ibid.*, 321, 324 *seq.*

³ Verallo and Dandino to Farnese, dat. Oct. 8, 1545 (*ibid.*, 330 *seqq.*); *cf.* also Dandino to Farnese of Oct. 9 (*ibid.*, 345 *seq.*).

⁴ In Spanish (*ibid.*, 647 *seq.*).

⁵ Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 291 *seq.*

⁶ The letter to Farnese in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 201 *seq.*; that to the Pope does not appear to be forthcoming (MERKLE, I., 293, n. 3). *Cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 293 *seq.*

the questions of faith into the background, and proposed that the Pope should send an answer through the Bishop of Caserta to the effect that, since the Emperor was set against a transference of the Council, he would proceed to open the same forthwith at Trent, but with the freedom and in the order which were the prerogatives of that body.

After the arrival of the Imperial embassy in Rome¹ it was decided provisionally in consistory on the 30th of October that the Council should be opened in any case before Christmas, the date to be determined in the next consistory.² This took place on the 6th of November, when it was finally settled that the opening should be held on the Third Sunday in Advent, December the 13th; the prelates absent from Trent were to be recalled.³ When the news of the great achievement⁴ of the Schmal-

¹ Marquina came to Rome on Oct. 24 (Nuntiatürberichte, VIII., 354, n. 4). On Oct. 26 Farnese wrote provisionally to the Legates that the arrival of their opinions had been most welcome (DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 203 *seq.*).

² Cf. EHSES, IV., 435, n. 5. On Oct. 31 Farnese informed the Legates of the decision (DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 204; also in Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 317). They received this on Nov. 7 (Massarelli, Diarium, ed. MERKLE, I., 310). Their reply to Farnese of Nov. 8 in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 209 *seq.* On Nov. 4 Farnese also informed the French nuncio Alessandro Guidiccioni (EHSES, IV., 434 *seq.*). On Nov. 4, 1545, L. Strozza *wrote from Rome to Mantua: "Di novo poco vi è che dire, non si parlando d' altro che del aprir questo concilio, del quale si parlerà ancora nel consistorio di venerdì" (Gonzago Archives, Mantua).

³ Extract from Consistorial Acts in EHSES, IV., 435, n. 5. Farnese's communication to the Legates of Nov. 7, 1545 (*ibid.*, 436); also in Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 317 *seq.* This reached Trent on Nov. 13 (*ibid.*, EHSES, IV., 436). On the following day the letters were drawn up for those prelates who in the meantime had left Trent (Massarelli, Diarium, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 319).

⁴ Cf. BRANDENBURG, Die Gefangennahme des Herzogs Heinrich von Braunschweig i. I., 1545, Leipzig, 1894.

kaldic League in capturing Duke Henry of Brunswick reached Rome, many believed that the Council would be prorogued once more.¹ But a letter of Cardinal Farnese of November the 21st² informed the Legates that the Pope remained determined that the Synod should be opened on the 13th of December. On the 24th of November Farnese communicated the same to Poggio,³ and on the 26th to Verallo and Dandino.⁴ A brief of the 24th of November exhorted the King of Portugal to send his prelates.⁵ On the 27th of November Morone who, as Legate, was still in residence at Bologna, was recalled to Rome in anticipation of the approaching Council.⁶

At the repeated request of the Legates a special Edict of Inauguration was sent to them in a brief dated the 4th of December 1545.⁷ After a congregation on the 7th of December of the Cardinal deputies for the affairs of the Council, Farnese sent the brief to Trent on the same day;⁸ it reached that city on the 11th.⁹ At the same time the Legates received a brief of the 5th of December which

¹ *Cf.* Ant. Borghesi's report, dat. Rome, Nov. 15, 1545 (State Archives, Siena).

² In DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 218. For the arrival of the letter in Trent on Nov. 27, *cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 335 *seq.* with n. 3.

³ In EHSES, IV., 439.

⁴ Three versions of the letter from Nov. 24 to 26 in the *Nuntiat-urberichte*, VIII., 441 *seqq.* For Friedensburg's opinion that the letter "can hardly have been sent," *cf.* EHSES, IV., 439 *seq.*, n. 2.

⁵ EHSES, IV., 438.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 440.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 442.

⁸ The accompanying letter from Farnese to the Legates of Dec. 7 in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 233. *Cf.* also EHSES, IV., 442 *seq.*, n. 3, who corrects several mistakes of Druffel regarding the letter.

⁹ *Cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 350 *seq.*; the Legates' letter to Farnese of Dec. 12, 1545, in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 236 *seq.*

gave permission to the German bishops to be represented by procurators on account of the gravity of their position and notwithstanding the promulgation of the earlier decree;¹ the execution of the brief lay, however, at the discretion of the Legates, who did not, however, publish it, but reserved it for use should emergencies arise.²

A host of difficulties had now been overcome. All was ready for the opening of the Council on German soil and in the ancient episcopal city of Trent. The longing of many years, the event around which so many baffled hopes had centred,³ was on the point of realization.

¹ In EHSES, IV., 443 *seq.* Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 15, n. 5.

² EHSES, IV., 444, n. 2.

³ Cf. *Seripando's memorandum in his Register, xxi, 131^b (General Archives of the Augustinian Order in Rome).

CHAPTER VI

TRANSACTIONS AND DECREES OF THE FIVE FIRST SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT (DECEMBER 1545 TO JUNE 1546).

ON receiving the Papal brief giving orders for the opening of the Œcumenical Synod on the 13th of December the Legates immediately appointed fasts and processions for the 12th and proclaimed an indulgence for those who received the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Communion. Since the shortness of the time did not permit of the observance, in the usual manner, of three previous days of fasting and prayer, those who found it impossible to prepare for the reception of the Holy Eucharist until the Sunday could obtain the indulgence on the following Sunday as well as if they fasted on the foregoing Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday and then made their communion. On the 12th of December the procession of the Tridentine clergy took place; in the afternoon a congregation of the conciliar prelates was held at Cardinal Cervini's lodgings, at which Cardinal Monte delivered an address and read aloud the brief of December the 4th, whereupon a discussion ensued on his proposals for the solemnities of the opening and the orders for the day of the first session.¹

¹ Herculis Severoli de Conc. Trid. Comment., ed. MERKLE, I., 1-4; Massarelli, Diarium, I., II., *ibid.*, 351, 400 *seq.*, 429; EHSES, IV., 445 *seq.* Differences arose on the question whether the mandates of the Legates should be read aloud. The Bishop of Jaén, Pedro Pacheco, at the instigation of the other Spanish prelates, the Neapolitans, and some others, demanded this. The Legates indeed declared, with an

Paul III. in a Bull of the 13th of December¹ ordered universal intercessions and processions to invoke God's protection on the Council and promised a plenary indulgence to all who took part in these pious exercises or, in case of hindrance, fulfilled some equivalent duty, fasted on the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday of the week following the promulgation of the Bull, went to confession, and on Sunday received the Holy Eucharist. In Rome the intercessory processions were held on the 14th, 15th, and 16th of December.²

On the 13th of December, the Third Sunday of Advent, the Council of Trent was solemnly opened.³ The Fathers assembled with the Legates in the Church of the Holy Trinity and thence proceeded in copes and mitres, accompanied by the clergy of the city, in solemn procession, singing the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, to the Cathedral, the choir of which had been fitted up as the council hall. Here the senior President of the Council, Cardinal del Monte, celebrated the solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost and published a plenary indulgence for those present. Bishop Cornelio Mussi of Bitonto then mounted the pulpit and preached a Latin appeal to the procedure of the eighth General Council, that the demand was untenable, but at the same time gave way in order to avoid dissension over a point of very minor importance (*cf.* MERKLE, I., 3, 400; EHSES, IV., 446, n. 2; see also PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 17, where misstatements of Sarpi are corrected). The Legates were housed in the palazzo Girolidi, destroyed in 1845 (see ZANELLA, S. Maria di Trento, Trento, 1879, 32, and GIULIANI in Arch. Trentino, I., 158 *seq.*).

¹ EHSES, IV., 446 *seq.* The Bull reached Trent on Dec. 28 (*cf.* Massarelli, Diarium, I., under the above date, ed. MERKLE, I., 361 *seq.*).

² Massarelli, Diarium, I., under Dec. 17, ed. MERKLE, I., 353; *cf.* EHSES, IV., 447, n.

³ The Acta of the opening session in EHSES, IV., 515-532. *Cf.* Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 4 *seq.*; Massarelli, Ordo aperitionis Conc. Trid., Dec. 13, 1545 (*ibid.*, 402-404); Massarelli, Diarium II. (*ibid.*, I., 429 *seq.*); PALLAVICINI, l. 5, c. 17.

sermon in which he gave his enthusiasm free course, not unmarked by faults of bad taste.¹ After Cardinal del Monte had read the prayers prescribed in the *ceremoniale*,² Bishop Tommaso Campeggio of Feltre read from the pulpit the Bull "Laetare Jerusalem" of the 19th of November 1544, and the Bull of the 22nd of February 1545 nominating the Cardinal-Legates.

After that Alfonso Zorilla, the secretary and theologian of the Imperial ambassador, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, presented a letter of apology from that diplomatist, who was detained in Venice by illness, and laid his mandate before the Council.³ Finally, Cardinal del Monte gave another short address,⁴ declared the Council open with the assent of the Fathers, and appointed the 7th of January for the second solemn session; the ceremonies ended with the singing of the *Te Deum*. Present at the opening session besides the three Papal Legates, Cardinals del Monte, Cervini, and Pole, were Cardinal Madruzzo of Trent, four archbishops: Antoine Filheul of Aix, Olaus Magnus of Upsala, Pietro Tagliavia of Palermo, and Robert Wauchope of Armagh, one-and-twenty bishops, five generals of orders, and the ambassador of King Ferdinand.⁵ Of the bishops the most noted were Juan

¹ In EHSES, IV., 521-529. PALLAVICINI (l. 5, c. 18) devotes an entire chapter to a vindication of this sermon against Sarpi's censures. On Pallavicini's defence, see EHSES' notes, *loc. cit.*, and MERKLE (I., 4, n. 3). See also BRISCHAR, I., 149 *seq.*, and DE LEVA, *Le prime sessioni del Concilio di Trento: Mem. d. Ist., Veneto, XX., 367 seq.* For the Cathedral of Trent, see HEIDER-EITELBERGER, *Mittelalterl. Kunstdenkmäler Österreichs*, I., Stuttgart, 1858, 155 *seq.*

² EHSES, IV., 516.

³ *Ibid.*, 517 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 519 *seq.*

⁵ The list of names and those of theologians and other personalities present in EHSES, IV., 529-532.

Pacheco of Jaén, soon afterwards made Cardinal,¹ Braccio Martelli of Fiesole, Tommaso Campeggio of Feltre, and Giacomo Nachianti of Chioggia. Among the generals of orders were the Servite, Agostino Bonucci, and the learned Augustinian Hermit, Girolamo Seripando.

The theologians present at the first session included four secular priests from Spain ; all the rest were regulars, namely, six Dominicans, among them Ambrogio Catarino and the famous Domenico Soto, ten Franciscan Observants, eight Franciscan Conventuals, five Augustinian Hermits, as many Carmelites, and four Servites. On the following day the Legates sent to Rome the announcement of the opening of the Council and applied for further instructions.²

Three general congregations, occupied with the organization and procedure of the Council, formed a preparation for the second session.³ In the congregation of December the 18th the Legates laid seventeen articles before the

¹ Together with Pacheco there were nominated Cardinals on Dec. 16, 1545 (*cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 707 *seqq.* ; CARDELLA, IV., 273 *seqq.*) : Georges d'Amboise, the Portuguese Infant Henry, 1533-1537, Bishop of Braga, since 1540 of Evora, which, out of consideration for him, was raised on Nov. 24, 1544, to the rank of a Metropolitan see (see GAMS, 99 ; *cf.* SCHÄFER, Portugal, III., 367 *seq.*), and the Pope's nephew Ranuccio Farnese. The last named, in accordance with the corrupt custom of the time, was made Archbishop of Naples in 1544, although only fifteen years old. It was quite unprecedented that two brothers should sit at the same time in the Sacred College, and Alessandro Farnese was displeased at the elevation of Ranuccio (see Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., ed. MERKLE, I., 311, 357, 364 *seq.*).

² The Legates to Farnese, dat. Dec. 14, 1545 (DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 241-244).

³ *Cf.* for these congregations the Acta in EHSES, IV., 533-546. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 6-16 ; Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., *ibid.*, 353-367 ; *Diarium* II., *ibid.*, 430-432 ; *Diarium* III., *ibid.*, 469-471 ; PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 12. KNÖPFLE in Wetzter and Weltes Kirchenlexicon, XI., 2nd ed., 2048 *seq.*

Fathers dealing with the external order of the Council and to be submitted for discussion in the next congregation.¹ The important question whether dogma or reform was to be discussed first in the Council was also brought before the Fathers in this first congregation and made the subject of debate.² As differences of opinion manifested themselves, a decision was for the time being postponed at the instance of Bishop Ferreri of Ivrea. In this congregation the Portuguese Dominican, Hieronymus ab Oleastro, as temporary ambassador of the King of Portugal, announced, in an address, the later arrival of orators from that monarch and presented his sovereign's letters of the 29th of July 1545 to the Council and the Pope, which were then read aloud.³

At the command of the King of France the Archbishop of Aix and the Bishop of Agde laid before the Legates, first in the congregation of December the 18th and then in that of the 19th, their instructions that the Council should not enter upon its deliberations before the arrival of the French ambassadors and the rest of the French prelates. This ominous suggestion, designed to put a check on the business of the Council, was, after previous deliberation with the prelates, met, on the 20th of December, by a refusal couched in intentionally vague and general terms and handed in writing to the two French dignitaries. The Council, it said, would always show becoming consideration for the King of France, as far as God's honour and that of the Synod permitted; but his Majesty, knowing

¹ The text in EHSES, IV., 533 *seq.*, and in Massarelli, *Diarium* I., ed. MERKLE, I., 354 *seq.*

² EHSES, IV., 534; Massarelli, *Diarium* II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 430, 469.

³ EHSES, IV., 534-536; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 7; Massarelli, *Diarium*, *ibid.*, 354, 430, 469 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 1. The letter of King John of Portugal in EHSES, IV., 425-426.

that the sessions of the Council admitted of no further delay, was requested to hasten the attendance of his representatives and bishops.¹

Since the discussion of the article presented on the 18th of December concerning the formal procedure of the Council led to no practical result,² in a congregation on the 22nd of December a commission consisting of the three bishops, of Ivrea, Cava, and Feltre, and the Auditor of the Rota, Pighini, was formed to deal with the matter first of all with the Legates, and then to report to the general congregation.³ Although the above named declined to serve, the three bishops were re-elected in the next general congregation of the Council on the 29th of December for a term of three months.⁴ On December the 22nd the question of the right to vote belonging to abbots and generals of orders⁵ had been left undecided. At the two next general congregations, on the 29th of December 1545⁶ and the 4th of January 1546,⁷ the subject came under discussion again. Opinions were widely divergent; some wished the voting to be vested exclusively in the bishops, others wished the decision to be deferred until the Council were more largely attended. Cardinal del Monte carried the point that the

¹ Cf. EHSES, IV., 536 *seq.*; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 7-9; Massarelli, *Diarium, ibid.*, 358 *seq.*, 431, 470 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 1, 1. The Legates' reports are in DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 251 *seqq.*

² The vote of Bishop Tommaso Campeggio of Feltre on this in EHSES, IV., 539.

³ EHSES, IV., 538; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 9.

⁴ EHSES, IV., 540; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 10, 12; Massarelli, *Diarium, ibid.*, 362, 431, 471.

⁵ EHSES, IV., 538; Massarelli, *Diarium, ed. MERKLE, I.*, 431, 471.

⁶ EHSES, IV., 541; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 10 *seq.*; Massarelli, *Diarium, ibid.*, 471.

⁷ EHSES, IV., 543 *seq.*; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 16; cf. especially the note in MERKLE, I., 11 *seq.*, and PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 2.

right to vote of the generals of orders should be recognized. After long discussion, and likewise on the motion of del Monte, it was decided in the case of abbots that the three Benedictine abbots sent by the Pope should have one vote collectively, not as abbots but as representatives of their Order.

In the general congregation held on the 4th of January, the senior President, del Monte, informed the Fathers more fully of a letter of Farnese of the 31st of December,¹ by which the Pope approved of what had been done and ordered the Legates to deal in the first instance with matters of faith; in so doing, however, only the doctrines and not the persons of heretics were to be condemned, a measure which aimed at conciliating the Protestants.² Further, the brief of the 1st of January 1546³ was read aloud, by which the Fathers in attendance at the Council were freed from contributions and permitted to draw upon their incomes. Later came up for recital and approval the decree appointed for publication in the second session, whereupon there arose, as was subsequently again repeated, a debate on the style and title of the Council.⁴ Several Fathers proposed in particular that to the title "Sacrosancta Tridentina Synodus" the clause used by earlier Councils,

¹ In DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 255-259. Cf. EHSES, IV., 542; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 12; PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 16, n. 2.

² The Council consented. "De cette manière," says MAYNIER (p. 285), "le concile ne refusait pas aux protestants le droit de se défendre, puisque leurs livres seuls, et non leurs personnes, se trouvaient en cause, et on pouvait répondre, à ceux qui lui reprochaient de juger des accusés sans les avoir cités et convaincus, qu'il n'y avait d'autres accusés que des ouvrages répandus partout."

³ In EHSES, IV., 545 *seq.*; cf. Severoli in MERKLE, I., 12; Massarelli, *Diarium, ibid.*, 366, 432.

⁴ Cf. EHSES, IV., 543; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 14; Massarelli, *Diarium III., ibid.*, 471; PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 2, n. 8-10.

“universalem ecclesiam repraesentans,” should be added. This proposal met with special opposition from Cardinals del Monte and Madruzzo. The first showed that it was uncalled-for to imitate thereby the precedents of Constance and Basle; the latter pointed out that this magniloquent title would only irritate the Protestants. The majority were in favour of rejecting the additional clause. Finally, on the 4th of January, certain conciliar officials were elected,¹ while some wished their nomination and appointment to proceed from the Pope, to which proposal some of the Fathers, zealous in their defence of the prerogatives of the Council, raised objection.² Paul III. had at first looked to the humanist Marcantonio Flaminio to be secretary to the Council; as the latter declined, the post was given provisionally on the 4th of January to Angelo Massarelli, hitherto private secretary to Cardinal Cervini, until the Council, which claimed for itself the right of appointment, should come to a final decision. Since Luigi Priuli, who, it would appear, had been chosen by the Council in the beginning of February, did not take up the office, Massarelli continued to hold it, and was tacitly recognized as secretary.³

¹ Cf. EHSES, IV., 544; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 14 *seq.*; Massarelli, Diarium, *ibid.*, 432, 471.

² Cf. EHSES, IV., 542; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 12 *seq.*; *cf.* also PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 1, n. 2-9. For still later objections, see MERKLE, I., 18, n. 2.

³ See for this MERKLE, I., xxxi *seq.*, who gives passages from the correspondence of the Legates with Farnese relating to the election of the secretary. MERKLE (I., lxxviii *seqq.*) devotes pages to a close examination of Massarelli, concerning whose life and numerous writings a variety of opinions has been held. He comes to several new conclusions. He defends the secretary of the Council against Druffel's charges of falsehood, with complete success (p. lxxx *seqq.*), but on the other hand opposes the attempts of the Italian party to canonize Massarelli's reputation.

On the Pope's nomination Achille de' Grassi was appointed consistorial advocate; the post of abbreviator was given to Ugo Boncompagni, noted for his great knowledge of canon law.¹

On the 7th of January 1546 the second session of the Council was held in the Cathedral of Trent.² It was opened by Bishop Juan Fonseca of Castellamare saying the Mass of the Holy Ghost and Bishop Coriolano Martirano of S. Marco preaching a sermon.³ After the usual prayers and ceremonies the secretary, Massarelli, read aloud an impressive exhortation from the Legates to the Fathers,⁴ composed by Cardinal Pole. In eloquent terms this document described the corruption of the Church and exhorted the Fathers to amendment and contrition of heart, whereby alone they could expect the descent of the Holy Spirit upon them. Especially urgent was the entreaty to expel all passions which can darken the reason, and never to lose sight of the sacred things of God by espousing the interests of the world.⁵ The Bishop of Castellamare then ascended the pulpit in order to read the Bull of April the 17th, 1545, forbidding Bishops to be represented at the Council by procurators, the brief of December the 4th at the opening of the Council,⁶ and lastly

¹ PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 1, n. 23; EHSES, IV., 544, n. 4. Achille de' Grassi arrived in Trent on March 4 (Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 509).

² The Acta in EHSES, IV., 547-564. Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 16-18; Massarelli, *Diarium* I.-III., *ibid.*, 367 *seq.*, 432, 472; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 5.

³ In EHSES, IV., 557-561.

⁴ Admonitio ill^{morum} legatorum ac patres concilii (EHSES, IV., 548-553).

⁵ EHSES, IV., 548 *seq.*; cf. DE LEVA, *Le Prime Sessioni*, 372 *seq.*

⁶ For the form in which the brief of Dec. 4, 1545, was read aloud, cf. EHSES, IV., 442 *seq.*, n. 3, 446, n. 1. Del Monte on the first reading

a decree on the blamelessness of life required of the Fathers. The last was approved unanimously; but the "placets" of nine Bishops were accompanied by protests against the omission in the title of the words "universalem ecclesiam repraesentans."¹ Bishop du Prat of Clermont, on the other hand, made complaint that in the decree the name of the King of France was not expressly mentioned together with that of the Emperor. Besides the three Legates and the Cardinal of Trent there were present four archbishops, six-and-twenty bishops, three abbots, and five generals of orders.²

In the interval between the second session and the third, appointed for the 4th of February, the position of the Legates towards the Pope and his Council had begun to be one of difficulty. General congregations were held on the 13th, 18th, 22nd, 26th, and 29th of January and on the 3rd of February.³ As in the first congregation, so in that of the 13th of January, the title of the Council gave rise to prolonged debate. The Legates, mindful of the opposition

in the general congregation of Dec. 12 had omitted the words of the original text, "juxta formam litterarum indictionis nostrae," as he was afraid that the Bull on the prohibition of the Procurators might be prejudiced thereby. In their letter to Farnese of Dec. 14 the Legates urged this danger, and on Dec. 30 received accordingly a new version of the brief, in which the words "juxta formam litterarum nostrarum" were substituted for those objected to by the Legates. In this form (as also given by EHSES, IV., 442) the brief was read out on Jan. 7.

¹ EHSES, IV., 556. The individual contrary votes were noted down by Massarelli on a single sheet of paper discovered by Merkle and given by him, p. 18, n. 1. Cf. also PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 5, n. 4.

² The list of those and of others present in EHSES, IV., 561-564.

³ See the Acta in EHSES, IV., 565-578; also Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 18-27; Massarelli, Diarium I., *ibid.*, 368-399; Diarium II., *ibid.*, 432-434; Diarium III., *ibid.*, 472-476; PALLAVICINI, I. 5, c. 6-8; KNÖPFLER in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlexicon, XI., 2nd ed., 2050-2052.

shown in the previous session, wished to bring the question to a final issue. They spoke against the addition "universalem ecclesiam representans." Cervini addressed the Fathers at great length,¹ followed by Madruzzo and Pacheco, who in this session appeared for the first time with the insignia of a Cardinal; then the Bishop of Astorga spoke, and also finally the Augustinian Seripando.

The last-named succeeded in silencing the opposition. Seripando pointed out in particular that there was no question of excluding that designation for ever; it was only a postponement until a larger attendance of members and the passing of important decrees gave a semblance of propriety to so pretentious a title. The opposing Bishops declared that they would not be fully satisfied until it was agreed that in future the words "œcumenical" and "general" should be inserted in the Decree, expressions already made use of by the Pope in his Bull of Convocation.²

These more formal controversies were trifling in comparison with the disputes occasioned by the very important question whether the Synod should begin with decisions on dogma or with disciplinary measures of reform. Paul III. wished for the former, Charles V. for the latter.

The primary consideration with the Emperor was the avoidance of offence to the Protestants, who would be embittered by the rejection of their new tenets at the outset of the Council; together with this he nourished a strong distrust of the Pope's intentions with regard to reform. The

¹ A fuller extract from Cervini's speech in Massarelli, *Diarium* I. ed. MERKLE, I., 374-377.

² EHSES, IV., 565; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 18-20. In Massarelli, *Diarium* II., III. (*ibid.*, 433-472) it says "universalis et œcumenica" instead of "œcumenica et generalis"; the latter words are used in the title of the Decrees of subsequent sessions. In the general congregation of Feb. 3 the protest of three Bishops was again renewed (EHSES, IV., 578; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 27).

latter started with the view that in accordance with ancient custom and the nature of the case, the safeguards of dogma, as the things of most importance, should first be settled. Paul III. also looked upon it as preposterous that instead of appearing as the accuser he should, of his own free will, place himself in the position of the accused, in order that in the meantime the contumacious might go unpunished while he submitted himself, as if they were the judges, to their criticism. Finally, he was afraid that the immediate treatment of the reform question by the Bishops would lead to a repetition of the occurrences of Constance and Basle.¹

Weighty reasons could be adduced in favour of the Pope's standpoint, above all the usage of the ancient councils. The Imperial ambassador Mendoza, himself an expert in canon law, acknowledged this.² Besides, it was clear to everyone that not only the morals of the Catholics stood in need of improvement, but that the faith of Christendom, so violently attacked, demanded protection. Notwithstanding, when the Legates endeavoured to carry out the Pope's wishes at Trent they met with passionate resistance. Already in the general congregation of the 18th of January 1546, and afterwards in that of the 22nd, the debates were long and violent.³ That reform should take the first place was urged especially by the Cardinal of Trent.⁴ The opposite standpoint was championed by Cardinal Pacheco and the Archbishop of Aix. The Bishop of

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 7.

² Cf. MAYNIER, 237.

³ Acta in EHSES, IV., 567-572; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 20-24; Massarelli, Diarium, *ibid.*, 379 *seq.*, 382-384, 473 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 7.

⁴ In the congregation of Jan. 18, the Cardinal of Trent, in the name of the Bishop of Capaccio, proposed that the Protestants should be once more invited. The proposal was rejected. (Massarelli, Diarium, ed. MERKLE, I., 380, 433, 473.)

Feltre, Tommaso Campeggio, brought forward on the 18th of January a proposal for a *via media*, that dogma and reform should be dealt with simultaneously.¹ As the Legates saw no possibility of carrying a resolution in the sense of the Papal instructions, they fell in on January the 22nd with the proposal of the Bishop of Feltre, whose reputation stood very high. Although Madruzzo still continued his opposition, the Legates were successful in carrying through the compromise of the Bishop of Feltre which was to be published as a decree at the next Session.²

Paul III., however, was in no way disposed to consent. On the 26th of January the Legates received a letter from Farnese dated the 21st and 22nd of January insisting on the Pope's determination that the treatment of matters of faith should have priority. The Legates, therefore, in order to gain time, put the question on the same day to the general congregation whether the date of the session might not be postponed, as the matters intended for publication then were not sufficiently advanced; no such decision, however, was reached. On the other hand, in the general congregation of the 26th an important resolution of another kind was carried. The negotiations as hitherto conducted had revealed the want of a settled order of business and of uniform guidance. Among the various proposals made in this respect, one at last which the Legates brought forward carried the day. It provided that the whole number of the Fathers should be divided into three separate classes, each of which should sit under the presidency and in the house of one of the three Legates, and prepare the agenda to be presented to the general congregation.³

¹ His vote in EHSES, IV., 568 *seq.*

² See EHSES, IV., 571.

³ See EHSES, IV., 572; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 24; Massarelli, *Diarium I., ibid.*, 392.

In the meantime the Legates were endeavouring, in repeated despatches to Rome, to justify the resolution of January the 22nd as unavoidable, and thereby to gain the Pope's approval.¹ In the short period remaining before the day of the session, the 4th of February, they could not hope to obtain this. Moreover, on the 30th of January they received once more a letter from Farnese dated the 27th, according to which the Pope's intentions were inflexible.² Consequently, after previous understanding with Cardinals Madruzzo and Pacheco³ on the same 2nd of February, when the three separated congregations met jointly for the first time, they brought forward the proposal that the decree appointing the simultaneous treatment of dogma and reform should not be published in the forthcoming session, nor for the present at all, but be reserved until the attendance at the Council had become more numerous. In the general congregation held on the following day it was resolved, in spite of the violent opposition of the Bishops of Badajoz and Astorga, that the decree should not be published at the session on the morrow, but be treated from henceforward as if it had been enacted.⁴ The Legates were now able to make this concession, since on the very evening of February the 2nd they had received a letter from Farnese dated the 30th of January according to which the Pope consented that the resolution of January the 22nd should not be withdrawn; only, the Legates were to take heed that the treatment

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 7, n. 14-16; MERKLE, I., 399, n. 8.

² DRUFFEL-BRANDI, n. 312.

³ On Feb. 1 (cf. Massarelli, *Diarium* I., ed. MERKLE, I., 369; cf. EHSES, IV., 544 *seq.*, n. 4). The general congregation which should have met on Feb. 1 was, on the receipt of the letter of Jan. 27, postponed, in order to gain time.

⁴ EHSES, IV., 575-578; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 26 *seq.*; Massarelli, *Diarium* I., *ibid.*, 433 *seq.*, 475 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 8, n. 6, 7.

of matters of faith should still be considered of primary importance.¹

As nothing else had been prepared for the session, which nevertheless was now bound to be held, it was resolved to publish only two decrees, the first of which should declare the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed to be the common foundation of all Christian belief and the presupposition on which all future definitions of faith must depend; the second, out of regard for the prelates whose attendance at the Council was still expected, should fix the ensuing session for the Thursday following "Laetare" Sunday, which would fall on the 8th of April.²

On the following day, the 4th of February 1546, in the third solemn session,³ at which the Archbishop, Pietro Tagliavia of Palermo, said Mass and the learned Dominican Ambrogio Catarino preached,⁴ these resolutions were accordingly passed. Only the Bishops of Fiesole, Capaccio, and Badajoz handed in written protestations against the omission of the phrase "ecclesiam universalem repraesentans," while the two latter also objected to the non-publication of the decree of the 22nd of January.⁵ Present at the session were the five Cardinals, six archbishops, six-and-twenty bishops, four generals of orders, and three abbots.

¹ EHSES, IV., 578, n. 1; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 7, n. 16.

² EHSES, IV., 577; Severoli and Massarelli, *loc. cit.*

³ The Acta in EHSES, IV., 579-588. Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 27 *seq.*; Massarelli, Diarium II., III., *ibid.*, 434, 476 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 9.

⁴ In EHSES, IV., 582-586.

⁵ These protests called forth from the Legates in the next general congregation on Feb. 8 another complete vindication of their previous proceedings (Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 28 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 11, n. 1-3). The Bishop of Fiesole, notwithstanding his protest against the omission of the additional clause, also renewed his opposition to the decrees of the following sessions.

According to the resolution of the general congregation of January the 22nd, letters in the name of the Council were to be addressed to the Pope, the Emperor, and the Christian princes thanking them for the goodwill hitherto manifested by them, and praying them to send a greater number of prelates. When these documents came up for recitation in the general congregation of the 29th of January, strong differences of opinion were revealed; in particular, a dispute arose over the precedence of the King of France or of the King of the Romans at the reading aloud of the letters in the session. As no agreement was reached, the reading of the letters and their approbation in the session was deferred, and also their despatch.¹

After the business under preparation had been settled and the order of procedure laid down in essentials,² the Council after the third session entered upon its active labours, and accomplished in the course of a year, up to the transference to Bologna, a considerable portion of its task, although the external condition of affairs was little favourable to the progress of a work undertaken in the greatest seriousness and with much enthusiasm.

The only German bishop present at the beginning of the Council, Michael Helding, Bishop of Sidon and auxiliary Bishop of Mayence, had, in obedience to a summons from the Emperor to the Colloquy at Ratisbon, been obliged to leave before Christmas, and was only able to attend the second session, leaving Trent immediately, on the following day, the 8th of January.³ Germany since then had only

¹ EHSSES, IV., 573 *seq.*; Massarelli, *Diarium* I., II., ed. MERKLE, I., 398, 433; PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 8, n. 1-3.

² KNÖPFLE in Wetzler und Welte, *Kirchenlexicon*, XI., 2nd ed., 2053-2056, gives a clear account of the standing orders.

³ Massarelli, *Diarium*, I., under Nov. 16, Dec. 23, and Jan. 8, ed. MERKLE, I., 327, 359, 369; *Diarium*, *ibid.*, 432.

been represented by the procurators of Cardinal Otto von Truchsess of Augsburg. German bishops were not to be expected for a while owing to the disturbed state of the Empire and the Emperor's attitude.¹ By the end of January and in the course of February various disquieting rumours were already current in Trent with regard to the intentions of the Protestants.² On the 29th of January Massarelli recorded that³ he had heard from Cardinal Madruzzo that the Protestants had offered to recover Piedmont from France for the Emperor if the latter would renounce his alliance with the Pope and withdraw his support from the Council. On the 23rd of February Madruzzo again affirmed on reliable sources of information that a deputation of German Protestants was shortly to be expected at Trent to assert the illegality of the Council.⁴ Luther's death, which took place on the 18th of February 1546, did not alter the hostile attitude of his followers towards the General Synod; Melancthon, on the contrary, now issued at the bidding of the Elector of Saxony a work in opposition to the Council;⁵ and soon afterwards two long pamphlets were printed by the Protestants, containing a rejection of the Council.⁶

From the side of the Imperial policy, the Council, after its opening on the 13th of December,⁷ contrary to the

¹ On May 14 the Dominican, Ambrosius Pelargus at last made his appearance as procurator to the Elector of Treves (Massarelli, *Diarium III.*, ed. MERKLE, I., 547 *seq.*).

² *Nuntiatürberichte*, VIII., 559 n.

³ *Diarium I.*, ed. MERKLE, I., 396.

⁴ *Diarium III.*, *ibid.*, 490.

⁵ KNÖPFLE in Wetzzer und Welte, *Kirchenlex.*, XI., 2nd ed., 2059.

⁶ *Cf.* PASTOR, *Reunionsbeitreibungen*, 326 *seqq.*

⁷ On Dec. 18, 1545, the nuncio Dandino wrote from Bois-le-duc to Farnese that the Imperial court was still convinced that the Council would not be held (*Nuntiatürberichte*, VIII., 501). After the actual

hopes of the court, met at first only with restrictions, since the plans of Charles V. as then existent were not in favour of the undisturbed progress of the dogmatic labours of the Fathers. The Emperor, already resolved to meet the Protestants, if necessity demanded, on the field of battle, wished first of all to make one more attempt at reconciliation by means of a religious conference to be held during the Diet appointed to meet at Ratisbon. To meet the justifiable offence caused by the resumption of such religious conferences after the Council had been opened, Charles, before his departure for Ratisbon, gave the nuncio Verallo a general assurance that affairs would be conducted there in such a manner as to give the Pope satisfaction. The religious colloquy was only a mask. The Emperor, however, expressed a wish that the Council might for a while suspend its labours in order to avoid irritation of the Protestants.¹ The religious discussions at Ratisbon, opened on the 27th of January but actually begun on February the 5th, were just as ineffectual and resultless as all their predecessors,² and ended in the departure of the Protestant disputants from the city on the 20th and 21st of March without having even waited for the Emperor's arrival.

About this time the Cardinal of Trent in a confidential opening of the Synod was made known, Verallo and Dandino wrote again, on Jan. 7, 1546, to Farnese that the Emperor had expressed to them his gratification at the news.

¹ Verallo to the Legates from Utrecht, dat. Feb. 4, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 547 *seq.*). Dandino and Marquina wrote likewise to Farnese (*cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 513); also Dandino to Cervini, dat. Feb. 4, 1546 (DRUFFEL, Karl IV., 528; *cf.* MERKLE, I., 482).

² See *infra*, p. 280 *seq.*; *cf.* also Cardinal Otto Truchsess' letter from Augsburg to Farnese and, in similar terms, to the Legates at Trent, dat. March 14, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 573 *seqq.*).

conversation with Massarelli¹ spoke of the danger of a transference of the Council to Germany, while the adoption of an Italian city would never meet with the consent of the Emperor and the Germans.

At last, on the 15th of March, the Imperial orator Francisco de Toledo also reached Trent. He was intended temporarily to replace Mendoza, who was ill, and afterwards, if it was necessary, to be joint representative with him of the Emperor at the Council. Francisco de Toledo paid his visit to the Legates on the 18th of March, and then, on Madruzzo's advice, went at once to Padua in order to confer personally with Mendoza and to come to a closer understanding. After his return he attended for the first time, on the 5th of April, a general congregation, and there presented his mandate; in the next general congregation, on the 7th of April, he received the written reply of the Council.² In the solemn session held on the following day all these documents were read aloud. From that time forward the intrusion of the Imperial policy into the procedure of the Council was carried on by the ambassadors with far greater want of consideration than had been shown hitherto by the Cardinal of Trent; for Charles V., in view of his attitude towards the Protestants, was seeking at any price to avoid the discussion of dogmatic questions. On the 25th of May, Mendoza also at last arrived in Trent.³

The Council in the meanwhile had applied itself to a subject which the Legates had brought forward in the general congregation of February the 8th: the establish-

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., under March 15, ed. MERKLE, I., 513; also in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 653.

² Cf. Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 436 *seq.*; *Diarium*, III., *ibid.*, 512, 517, 530; Severoli, *ibid.*, 44, 48; PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 13.

³ Cf. Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., ed. MERKLE, I., 439; *Diarium*, *ibid.*, 550.

ment of the Canon of Holy Scripture as the foundation and bulwark of the defence of Church doctrine. Here clear definition was all the more necessary as the Reformers appealed in the first instance to the Bible, certain portions, however, of which they rejected. The question therefore had to be examined, whether all the books of the Old and New Testaments in common use were to be regarded as parts of Holy Scripture; and also a point of no less importance, what respect was due together with the written word to that ecclesiastical tradition which the Protestants had entirely discarded.

One only among the Fathers of the Council, Nachianti, Bishop of Chioggia, a man of Protestant tendencies, was of opinion that tradition should be disregarded, since in the gospels all was written down that was necessary to salvation and the Christian life. This view, however, was rejected and refuted by appeal to Holy Scripture and the ancient Fathers. On the establishment of the Canon of Holy Scripture animated debates from time to time arose.

After long discussion in the general congregations of the 12th, 15th, and 26th of February, the 5th, 17th, and 27th of March, the 1st, 3rd, 5th, and 7th of April, and in the particular congregations preceding them, which were accompanied by meetings of the theologians, the two decrees were at last agreed to which were published in the solemn session of the 8th of April 1546.¹ The first dogmatic decree,

¹ For the negotiations and events between the third and fourth sessions, *cf.* Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 28-48; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., *ibid.*, 434-437; *Diarium*, III., *ibid.*, 477-533; EHSES, V., 3-89; PALLAVICINI, I. 6, c. 11-16; KNÖPFLER, in *Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlex.*, XI., 2nd ed., 2056 *seq.*; EHSES, in the *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XI., 598 *seq.*, in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XXVI., 300 *seq.*, and in the *Dritten Vereinschrift der Görres-Gesellschaft* for 1908, 37 *seq.* For the fourth

“Of the Canonical Scriptures” (de canonicis Scripturis), declares not only the Old and New Testaments, but also apostolic tradition, to be the sources of the Church’s doctrine, and sets forth the Canon of the Bible. The discussions on the misuses which had become current with regard to editions and translations of the Holy Scriptures, as well as with regard to their interpretation and use, led to the second decree of the fourth session, “Of the editing and use of the Sacred Books” (de editione et usu sacrorum librorum). Here it was in the first place declared that the ancient Latin version, preserved for so many centuries by the usage of the Church under the name of the “Vulgata,” was in public recitals, disputations, sermons, and expositions to be held to be authentic, and no one was to dare, under any pretext whatever, to reject it. This, as had been set forth in the preceding discussions, did not assert that the language or form of the Vulgate was incapable of improvement, but only that in matters of faith and morals it contained no errors. In the same province of teaching it was enacted that all interpretations of Holy Scripture were forbidden which did not adhere to the sense held by the Holy Catholic Church, or disagreed with the clear consensus of the Fathers. Further, the decree prescribed the greatest care and accuracy in the future issue of editions of the Bible, and ordained that for the future no books on religious subjects should be published without ecclesiastical authority.¹

sitting, of April 8, 1546, *cf.* Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 48–50; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., *ibid.*, 437 *seq.*, 534; EHSSES, V., 90–104; PAL-LAVICINI, I. 6, c. 16.

¹ For the two decrees, *cf.* KAULEN, *Gesch. der Vulgata*, Mainz, 1868, 379–419. No decision was come to with regard to the translation of the Bible into the vernacular (see PETERS, *Kirche und Bibellesen*, Paderborn, 1908, 24). That no adverse measures were taken, as

Besides these two decrees of the 8th of April, it had been intended to publish a third in the same session on a resolution of the general congregation held on the previous day. This was to contain an indictment "in contumaciam" against the bishops who still abstained from attending the Council. But before the proceedings began, the Legates were induced by the ambassadors of Charles V., supported by the two Imperialist Cardinals, to drop the publication for the present; it was represented that Charles V. and other princes would take offence, whereupon the majority declared themselves in favour of postponement.¹ At this session the Archbishop of Sassari sang the High Mass, and the Servite General, Agostino Bonuccio, preached, while the prelates in session were the five Cardinals, eight archbishops, forty-one bishops, four generals of orders, and three abbots.² The time between the third and fourth sessions was occupied with the transactions of the Legates with the Pope over an important matter of ecclesiastical reform.

After Paul III. had given his consent to the resolution of the 22nd of January 1546 that the Council should treat questions of reform and dogma concurrently, the Bull "Superni dispositione,"³ probably drawn up in January 1542 but not published, was again produced, with fresh suggestions for revision,⁴ and conveyed to the Legates

Cardinal Pacheco wished, was due to Cardinal C. Madruzzo, the single German prelate who was then present at the Council. (See EHSES in the Dritten Vereinschrift der Görres-Gesellschaft for 1908, 46.)

¹ Cf. Severoli, *loc. cit.*; PALLAVICINI, *loc. cit.*; EHSES, V., 93.

² EHSES, V., 101 *seq.*

³ The text of the Bull in EHSES, IV., 489-498. For the date of its appearance, *ibid.*, 489 *seq.*, n. 6, and its subsequent fortunes, *ibid.*, 498 *seq.*

⁴ In EHSES, IV., 499 *seq.*

for their opinion on the 17th of February 1546.¹ By this document the jurisdiction of the bishops in their dioceses was to be extended as against the limits imposed by the Roman Curia, and some of the most crying abuses done away. In their answer of the 7th of March² the Legates pointed out the necessity that, in this matter, the Pope's ruling should not be one-sided, but be preceded by consultation in the Council. At the same time, in their letter to Cardinal Farnese³ they expressed themselves without reserve on the general expectation and demand for reforms, and showed that the programme contained in the Bull under consideration was quite inadequate. Paul III. was in no way displeased with their candour, and sent answers through his secretary Maffei and Cardinal Farnese on the 13th and 23rd of March 1546, consenting to the submittal of the question of reform to the Council, while reserving to himself a certain amount of co-operation by reconstructing the Bull in conformity with their observations.⁴

In a letter of acknowledgment dated the 10th of April 1546 the Legates again unfolded with much detail their reasons for insisting that the labours of reform should be a joint burden to be borne by the Council in combination with the Pope.⁵

They first laid stress on the necessity of reform of the *Dataria*, which must begin with deeds and not with the issue

¹ Cf. Farnese's letter to the Legates of Feb. 17, 1546 (DRUFFEL-BRANDI, II., n. 343, p. 390; EHSES, IV., 499).

² *Considerationes legatorum concilii super bulla, quam proposuerat edere Paulus III. super reformatione*, in EHSES, IV., 500 *seq.*

³ In EHSES, IV., 501 *seq.*; cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 13, n. 6; KNÖPFLER in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlex.*, XI., 2nd ed. 2058.

⁴ See DRUFFEL-BRANDI, n. 368, 386; EHSES, *Kirchliche Reformarbeiten*, 404.

⁵ DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 469. A full account of the contents in PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 2.

of Bulls. But besides the reform of this tribunal, that of the Consistory was also absolutely imperative. The primary consideration must be to bestow bishoprics with proper caution and sense of responsibility, and in places where the appointment lay in the hands of princes to accept such persons only as possessed the proper qualifications in age, worthiness, and learning, and were able and willing to reside in their sees. The appointment to a plurality of bishoprics must, even in the case of Cardinals, be entirely abolished.

The reform of the episcopate, the Legates continued, consists mainly in the enforcement of the duty of residence; with regard to the regular clergy, the presence of Generals of Orders at the Council permits of the necessary settlement being reached; as to the secular power, the canonical penalties against the transgressors of ecclesiastical jurisdiction must be renewed, and with an increase of severity. As far as the rights of the Apostolic See are concerned, all depends upon the just dealing of the Pope. The grievances of the bishops are specially directed against pensions, tenths, the ordination of unworthy priests, the exemptions granted to protonotaries and other privileged persons, against the absolutions of the Penitentiaria, and above all against the bestowal of benefices carrying with them a cure of souls on unfit recipients, who are non-resident and pluralists. The Dataria must be inflexible in filling up vacancies only with men of competent learning and approved piety, who have the inclination and the sense of duty to discharge their functions in person. For the training of a good body of clergy the Legates advised the encouragement of seminaries, and with justifiable severity they finally denounced the monstrous abuses of the so-called reversions.

In a letter to Farnese of the 15th of April¹ the Legates,

¹ DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 474; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 2, n. 7, 8.

with a thorough recapitulation of the state of things, asked what matters were now first to be taken in hand. Farnese's answer of the 24th of April¹ expressed the Pope's full approval of the Legatine programme of reform, but insisted that their labours in this direction should not retard the progress of their dogmatic decisions, and that the Council should not pass resolutions without the Pope's consent, just as he wished to carry out the measures of reform immediately and directly affecting himself, only in agreement with the Synod.

The approbation of the decrees published at the fourth session of the Council by Paul III. gave rise to difficulties which were only removed after long negotiation.² Not only the commission of theologians appointed by the Pope to consider the decrees, but also the College of Cardinals, expressed unfavourable criticism of the proposition that the Vulgate, without previous revision or improvement, simply as it stood, was to be declared authentic. It was only after repeated and elaborate justification of the decrees on the part of the Legates that the approbation of the Pope was obtained.

After the fourth session the Council³ in the general congregation of the 15th of April was occupied with the still unsettled questions of reform which were now to form the subject of discussion in the fifth. The Easter season offered a moment of respite. Then in the general congre-

¹ DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 482; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 2, n. 10.

² *Cf.* KAULEN, *Gesch. der Vulgata*, 421-426; PALLAVICINI, l. 6, c. 17; l. 7, c. 12; KNÖPFLER, *loc. cit.*, 2059. The correspondence between the Legates and Rome belonging to this period in VERCELLONE, *Dissert. Acad.*, Roma, 1864.

³ For the time between the fourth and fifth sessions, *cf.* Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 50-80; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., *ibid.*, 438-441; *Diarium*, III., *ibid.*, 534-554; EHSES, V., 105 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 3-12; KNÖPFLER, *loc. cit.*, 2059-2061.

gations of the 10th, 18th, 20th, and 21st of May the work proceeded.¹ There was a discussion on the erection of chairs of exegesis of Holy Scripture and the art of preaching. In dealing with the highly necessary reform of the pulpit, particular attention was directed to the limitation of the privileges of the monks. The debates on this point were occasionally very heated; as usual, Bishop Martelli of Fiesole gave way to uncurbed violence of language. He was met by the Dominican, Caselli, Bishop of Bertinoro, who in other ways also was at great pains to refute all the grounds of objection brought against the religious orders. A great impression was made by a speech from the General of the Augustinian Hermits, Seripando, who in very calm and effective words balanced the reasons for the exercise of the preacher's office by the bishops or the regular clergy. Seripando showed clearly that under existing circumstances the bishops and parish priests could not meet the exigencies of preaching in a diocese. After thus proving the necessity of calling in the regulars as auxiliaries, he went on to show how unreasonable it was that even in their own churches they should be entirely dependent on the bishops.² The bishops' duty of residence was also treated in the general congregation of the 10th of May, and again on the 9th and 10th of June. The decision on this difficult question was, however, postponed to a later date.

The Imperial ambassador, Toledo, supported by Cardinal Madruzzo and the other prelates of the Emperor's party, did all he could to prevent dogmatic questions also being prepared for the next session.³ To this wish of the Emperor the Legates opposed the, for them, more authori-

¹ EHSES, V., 132 *seq.*

² The reform decree was passed on June 15 and 16.

³ PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 3.

tative wish of the Pope. They wrote in any case to Rome for powers to enable them to suspend the Council rather than to be forced to yield to the Emperor's attacks on its freedom. After they had once more received, through a letter of Farnese of May the 13th, the intimation that they were to pay no regard to the Emperor's objections, they laid before the general congregation of May the 24th the article on original sin as the subject of discussion for the dogmatic decree of the forthcoming session. This important topic occupied the general congregation on the 28th and 31st of May, the 4th, 5th, 8th, 9th, and 14th of June; on the 16th of June the decree was drawn up.¹ It contained a thorough and lucid definition, in opposition to the vacillating doctrines of the Protestants, of the nature of original sin, of its propagation, of its consequences, and its remission in baptism.

The Immaculate Conception of Mary was also the subject of deliberations of the most profound and weighty character. Cardinal Pacheco had already proposed the definition on the 28th of May.² The newly arrived theologians of the Pope, Laynez and Salmeron of the Society of Jesus, maintained the same view with ardour, and were supported by no inconsiderable number of the Fathers. The opposition came chiefly from the Dominicans. They were so strong that Pacheco on the 8th and 14th of June moved that the decree should only contain the words, "The Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God is a pious opinion."³ But even on this point Pacheco was not successful; the majority were against any immediate decision on the question.

¹ See EHSSES, V., 163 *seq.*, 166 *seq.*, 172 *seq.*, 182 *seq.*, 193 *seq.*, 199 *seq.*, 212 *seq.*, 218 *seq.*, 233 *seq.*; *cf.* *Histor. Jahrb.*, XXVII., 70 *seq.*

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 64 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 3, n. 8; c. 7; DRUFFEL-BRANDI, p. 539.

³ Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 70, 76.

The Synod at the end of the decree only declared that it was not their intention to include in this decree on Original Sin the blessed and immaculate Virgin Mary and Mother of God (*non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei Genitricem*). The terms of the ordinances of Sixtus IV. on this question were adhered to.¹

The decree on Original Sin was published on the 17th of June 1546 in the fifth public session.² This was attended by the three Cardinal Legates and Cardinal Pacheco,³ nine archbishops, forty-eight bishops, two mitred Benedictine abbots, three generals of orders, many theologians, and the Imperial ambassadors. The solemn High Mass was sung by Bishop Alessandro Piccolomini of Piacenza, while the Dominican, Marco Laureo, preached. The final passing of the dogmatic decree raised once more objections from Cardinal Pacheco and a certain number of other bishops on account of the omission of an express clause on the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

After this dogmatic decree came another for publication of a sound reforming character. It dealt with the Holy Scriptures, instituted expert instruction in the same, and regulated preaching. Among particular enactments was one ordering that in cathedral churches, where foundations already existed for lectures on theology and

¹ Cf. our remarks, Vol. IV. of this work, 394 *seq.*

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 88-82; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., *ibid.*, 441, 554; EHSSES, V., 238 *seqq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 7, c. 13.

³ Madruzzo was absent. He had gone on May 12, at the Emperor's request, to the Diet at Ratisbon (Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 547), and had indeed returned thence to Trent on June 14, but, after a visit to the Legates, had at once continued his journey to Rome, where he had to present to the Pope proposals from the Emperor (*ibid.*, 554; cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., viii-xi, 46 *seqq.*).

Holy Scripture, the bishops must provide that those who drew the salaries also carried out the obligations. In other churches where no such foundations existed, vacant livings should be given to learned men, or a common contribution be levied to endow suitable lectureships on the Holy Scriptures. Nor should similar instruction be lacking in convents, and princes ought to be exhorted to supply such lectureships to universities where they were still lacking. But in order that, under the show of godliness, godlessness might not be sown, no one should be permitted to exercise such functions privately or publicly who had not been examined first by the Bishop as to his manner of life, his opinions, and his knowledge, and been found approved.

With regard to preaching, it was ordered that bishops, archbishops, primates, and all other prelates of the Church should be bound in duty themselves to preach the gospel, and in case of hindrance to find suitable persons to take their place ; that parish priests should at least on all Sundays and feast days, either in person or through fitting substitutes, teach those things the knowledge of which is necessary to salvation, whereby in short and intelligible words they may point out the faults which men ought to shun, and the virtues after which they should strive. The regular clergy, even in the churches of their order, are forbidden to preach before they have received from their superior a certificate of character and learning and a permission from the bishop ; preachers who disseminate errors or cause scandal must be forbidden the pulpit by their bishops, and if they have been teachers of heresy be dealt with according to the customs of the locality ; the bishop, however, should be careful that no preacher is molested on false charges or otherwise given cause for just complaint. Regulars who are not enclosed and secular priests who have not undergone sufficient examination must not under any pretext

receive episcopal permission to preach until they have made application to the Holy See. The collectors of alms or questuaries shall never preach themselves or get others to preach for them.

At the request of the Archbishop of Sassari, the brief of June the 7th to the Legates, in which the Pope confirmed the decrees of reform, was then read aloud. Finally, the Promotor of the Council, Severoli, raised the charge "in contumaciam" against the still absent prelates. The proposed opening of the case against them was, however, deferred, since in the voting opinions were much divided as to which bishops should incur liability. Pacheco claimed immunity for the Germans; others wished to restrict the proceedings solely to those who were in Italy, or only in Rome, without making their appearance in Trent.

On the very day before the session a courier reached Trent from Ratisbon who brought to the Legates the Emperor's pressing entreaties that they should omit dogmatic decisions in the forthcoming session, out of consideration for his policy towards the Protestants. It was obviously no longer possible to give effect to this wish.¹

The sixth session had been fixed for the 29th of July. In the general congregation on the 21st of June the Legates decided that the agenda for the session should comprise the dogmatic decree on justification and the measures of reform relating to episcopal residence and its hindrances.²

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 76 *seq.*, n.; *ibid.*, Verallo's letter to Farnese of June 13 from Ratisbon.

² For the time between the fifth and sixth sessions, see Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 82-121; Massarelli, Diarium, II., III., *ibid.*, 441-458, 554-601; PALLAVICINI, I. 8; KNÖPFLER, in Wetzler und Welte, Kirchenlex., XI., 2nd ed., 2063-2065.

The Pope and the commission appointed for the Council were here entirely at one. The Legates were all the more in earnest as they held that on the article on justification all other dogmas depended, just as all other reform legislation depended more or less on the enforcement of episcopal residence. In order to give support to the discussion of these two important points the Pope deputed a band of distinguished theologians.¹ The envoy of the republic of Lucca affirmed with satisfaction that the fifth session had been held with the participation of nearly seventy voting members, so that opponents could now no longer point the finger of criticism at the slender number of those who attended the Synod.² Spirits rose still higher when on the 26th of June the ambassadors of France at last made their entry into Trent. They were Claude d'Urfé, Jacques de Lignières, and Pierre Danès. Their letters as plenipotentiaries were to be presented at the general congregation on the 30th. It seemed as if on this occasion the conflicting claims of the French and the representative of Ferdinand I. might lead to an unseemly quarrel over precedence. The wisdom of the Legates, however, found a way of escape which satisfied both parties. In consequence the Imperial ambassador, Mendoza, attended in person the solemn reception of the French envoys. In his oration Danès called to mind, yet in moderate terms, the services rendered by the French Kings to the Church, in order afterwards to lay special emphasis on the fact that Francis I. had always kept his kingdom pure from any stain of error. The most important passage in his speech was the exhortation to the Fathers to restore unity to Christendom on the firm basis of dogma, and thence to proceed to a thorough reform of ecclesiastical evils. In

¹ See PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 1.

² Cf. EHSSES, in the Röm. Quartalschrift, XIX., 180.

the execution of this programme King Francis would array all his power on their side.¹

The appearance of the French ambassadors and their declarations encouraged the hope that the Synod would soon be more amply constituted by the arrival of the French bishops. Meanwhile the Fathers threw all their energy into the settlement of the doctrine of justification, which, as yet, had hardly ever come within the scope of Conciliar treatment. They hoped in deep earnest that this subject, which struck at the capital doctrines of the Protestants, would be mastered in time for the sixth session, appointed to meet on the 29th of July.²

While thus everything warranted the prosperous continuation of the labours of the Council, suddenly unforeseen difficulties arose which threatened even to cut short its days. The long-impending war between Charles V. and the Protestant Estates had broken out, and the Emperor and the Council were links in a closely forged chain.

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 3; MAYNIER, 364 *seq.*

² EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 181.

CHAPTER VII.

THE PAPAL-IMPERIAL LEAGUE OF JUNE 1546. THE SCHMALKALDIC WAR.

WITH ever growing success the political and military organisation of the Protestant Estates known as the Schmalkaldic League continued their efforts to weaken the Imperial authority in accordance with the principle, "Cujus regio ejus religio," to set up within their own boundaries the supremacy of religious absolutism, and to establish an order of things which should leave no room for the ecclesiastical princes, especially those who still clung to the belief and discipline of the Catholic Church.

The Emperor had laboured in vain to bring the ecclesiastical troubles to an end by means of a peaceable settlement and to appease the Confederates of Schmalkald by far-reaching concessions. Every new success only emboldened the latter to make fresh encroachments. Now, as before, they were suitors for foreign help; now, as before, their proceedings within the limits of the Empire bore everywhere the stamp of the negation of that Empire's laws.

If the existing system of the law was not to founder utterly, the aggressions of the Protestant Estates would have to be met by force of arms. Even the Emperor convinced himself of this at last. According to his own memoirs, the thought of encountering the Protestant Estates of the Empire on the field first came to Charles V. after his successful overthrow of the Duke of Cleves in the

summer of 1543.¹ At first the time was not fully ripe; some fresh provocations must yet be given. The strongest was undoubtedly the stubborn refusal of the Protestant Estates to attend the Council summoned by the Pope, because it was neither general nor free, nor even Christian.

In the meantime the peace with France had entirely altered the political situation, and created the possibility of giving a decisive turn to affairs in Germany by an appeal to the sword. The protestantizing Estates were not blind to the danger which they thus incurred. Nevertheless, with the temerity of previous successes, they demanded of the Emperor impracticable terms: either security against the decrees of the Council by a recognition under the laws of the Empire of a territorial ecclesiastical system, or a council without the Pope, which was identical with the subversion of the whole ecclesiastical constitution then existing.²

At the time of the Diet of Worms, when the Protestant policy of entire disavowal of the "papistical council" at Trent was made manifest,³ the plan of Charles V. to apply force had already assumed so definite a shape that he proposed to Cardinal Farnese in May 1545, an offensive alliance with the Pope against the Protestant Estates. The Cardinal hastened joyfully to Rome, where the Pope at once entered into the scheme and ordered preparations for war to be begun at once. But it soon became evident that the Emperor, fully apprised of the greatness and difficulty of the undertaking, had made up his mind to defer hostilities until the following year.⁴

The Pope consented, and, in conformity with the

¹ *Cf. supra*, p. 206.

² *Cf. RANKE*, *Deutsche Gesch.*, IV., 6th ed., 256, 258 *seq.*

³ *JANSSEN-PASTOR*, III., 18th ed., 587 *seq.*

⁴ *Supra*, pp. 223, 227 *seqq.*

Emperor's wishes, took advantage of Andelot's presence to have a draft drawn up of the articles of the Papal-Imperial League for the overthrow of the protesting Estates.¹ To the terms of this proposal, however, the Imperialists had many objections. They disliked, to begin with, the wording of the preamble that the use of force appeared necessary to Charles V., since in consequence of the determined refusal of the Protestants no more hopes could be entertained of the removal of the religious troubles by the Council. They also took exception to the clause stating that the Emperor ought not, without the express sanction of Paul III., to enter into any negotiations with the Protestants. They also demurred to the subsidy being restricted to 200,000 ducats, and the payment of the auxiliaries to a period not longer than four months.² As the nuncios Dandino and Verallo did not feel authorized in introducing alterations of such importance into the document, Marquina, who had come to Rome in October 1545 on the matter of the Council, undertook to negotiate with the Pope concerning the objections to the draft treaty and other wishes of the Emperor as well, bearing on the taxes to be levied on the Spanish ecclesiastical funds.³

The political situation was further improved for the Emperor by the armistice concluded with the Turks in November 1545 by Ferdinand I.⁴ Not less favourable was the continuance of war between France and England, which deprived the Schmalkaldians of any hope of support from either of those powers. But in the Empire

¹ The text of the draft in *Deutschen Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, III. (1890), 416 *seq.*

² See *Nuntiattriberichte*, VIII., 50 *seq.*, 321 *seq.*, 326 *seq.* Cf. DRUFFEL, *Beiträge*, I., 3.

³ See *Nuntiattriberichte*, VIII., 51 *seq.*

⁴ See ZINKEISEN, II., 860 *seq.*

itself affairs were undergoing a development which almost forced the Emperor to take decisive steps against the Protestant Estates.¹

The latter were always usurping new positions. In August 1545, Duke Augustus of Saxony appointed a Protestant "bishop" in Merseburg; in October, Sebastian von Heusenstamm was chosen, through the intrigues of Philip of Hesse and contrary to the wishes of the Emperor and the Pope, to succeed Albert of Brandenburg in Mayence, where the Protestant party promised themselves that he would follow the example set by the Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann von Wied. The latter, when Paul III. took action against him, had appealed, on the 11th of July 1545, to a free Christian council to be held in Germany or to a Diet, and gave in his adhesion to the Schmalkaldic League.²

The affairs of Cologne caused anxiety to the Emperor, not merely because by the introduction of Protestantism on the Rhine his possessions in the Netherlands were seriously threatened, but because of other reasons beyond that. As the secession of the Elector Palatine Frederick to the new religion was to be expected, the Protestants, in the event of Hermann von Wied holding his own, would have a majority in the Electoral College. If the Catholic Church in Germany collapsed, the fall of the Roman-German Empire would follow.³

Charles V. was fully conscious of the gravity of the

¹ This is EDELHAAF'S opinion (II., 444). "Unless the Emperor," says HUBER (IV., 120), "wished to renounce all his plans for good and all and to forfeit all authority in Germany, only one course lay open to him—war."

² Cf. GULIK, Gropper, 114 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 611 *seq.*; HASENCLEVER, Politik der Schmalkaldner, 27 *seq.*, 151 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 60.

³ Cf. EDELHAAF, II., 446 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 613.

situation. In his memoirs he summed up his feelings at the time in the words: "Come what will, I am determined, dead or alive, to remain Emperor in Germany."¹

Although Charles did not conceal from himself the greatness and difficulties of his enterprise, he did nothing precipitately. To the Pope he showed himself determined to have the form of the treaty altered. The negotiations over this were protracted, but when Marquina left Rome at last on the 13th of December 1545 he had gained weighty advantages for his master. On December the 27th he presented to the Emperor at Bois-le-Duc the answer of Paul III., containing important concessions. The preamble of the treaty was entirely altered; it now ran that the Emperor and Pope allied themselves in support of the Council. A larger subsidy than 200,000 ducats Paul III. refused, but, on the other hand, he consented to extend the payment of the auxiliaries over another two months, making a total of six months. Further, he declared his readiness to help the Emperor should he be attacked unjustly by any other prince—France was meant,—not only during the war against the Protestant Estates, but also for six months after its termination. The article which made it impossible for Charles V. to enter into pacific negotiations with the Protestants before the outbreak of war seems to have been allowed to drop out of sight at Rome. On the other hand, Paul III. insisted that while war continued, the Emperor, without the express consent of the Holy See, should be debarred from making any agreement with the Protestants, so far as the object of the war was concerned, and in particular any compromise on matters of religion.²

¹ Commentaires, 229. Cf. MOCENIGO in the Fontes. rer. Austr., XXX., 81 *seq.*

² Cf. DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 3; Karl V., IV., 1 *seq.*; DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 239; Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 53 *seq.*, 512 *seq.*

If not all, yet the essential wishes of the Emperor were thus satisfied. It was therefore to be expected that the signature of the treaty thus amended would now take place, but instead of this, the decisive moment was again put off. At the Imperial court various tendencies were at work. The Emperor's confessor, Pedro Soto, was for war, and composed a report, exposing with great acumen the weak side of the Schmalkaldic League, in order to remove the Emperor's fears. To the confessor Granvelle stood opposed, and Charles, who on the whole liked to put things off, deferred his decision and declared he would not settle the treaty before he got to Ratisbon. He hoped not merely to obtain still further alterations in the agreement, but also was afraid lest in the event of a final determination the Protestants should get to know beforehand of the blow that was being aimed at them, and thus be able to take counter-measures the more easily.¹

Besides deceiving the enemy, it was of the first importance for the success of the undertaking that alliances should be won and the right time chosen for delivering the first blow. With admirable circumspection the Emperor bent his mind on creating a political situation favourable to the approaching war. If even in this respect he achieved successes which were of no mean value, yet from time to time he was visited by grave doubts as to the possibility of carrying through an enterprise on the success of which his all was staked. The indecision with which in February and March 1546 he still continued to express himself with regard to his military plans justifies the conclusion that if a means had offered itself of attaining his

¹ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 54 *seq.*, 518 *seq.*, 545; the letters of Charles V. of Feb. 16, 1546, in MAURENBRECHER, 36* *seq.*; for which compare DRUFFEL, Karl V., IV., 458; Soto's memorial in MAURENBRECHER, 29* *seq.*

end without having recourse to war, in no case would he have thrust that instrument aside.¹

In the first place, Charles V. on the 27th of January 1546, allowed the religious conference, already promised in the Recess of Worms for the 30th of November 1545, to begin at Ratisbon. It must be assumed that he wished thereby to gain time and also to make an impression on the Pope,² since he can hardly have reckoned on any sort of success. The prospects of a friendly agreement were more unfavourable than ever. It was not merely that since the last attempt of this kind, made five years before, the feeling on both sides had altered essentially, and that all hope had departed of ever attaining anything by means of such conferences, but the position of the Catholics was one of the utmost difficulty since the sessions of the Council of Trent had begun. From nearly all the Catholic princes the Emperor had received refusals. The staunch Catholics were more than ever disinclined for conferences on religion, since the total failure in 1541 of the colloquy at Ratisbon arranged by the representatives of the middle party in conjunction with the Emperor. In these strict circles the opinion had been reached, not incorrectly, that in such conferences the Protestants had always come off as the winning side. Even from the side of the disputants themselves difficulties were in store for the Emperor. Julius Pflug, in whom Charles placed special confidence, and to whom, for that reason, he had offered the place of President, declined on grounds of weak health. Even the Bishop of Eichstätt, Moritz von Hutten, who thereupon consented to fill the post, declared that he was only there in order to attend to the external order of the conference, but not to express his opinions on matters of faith. The Catholic theologians,

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, VIII., 57 *seq.*, 65 *seq.*

² Cf. DRUFFEL, Beiträge, III., 508 ; HASENCLEVER, 217, 218.

the Spanish Dominican Malvenda, Eberhard Billick, the Provincial of the Augustinians, Johann Hoffmeister, and Cochläus, who obeyed the Emperor's summons, addressed letters to friendly curialists begging them to prevent the Pope from attaching an unfavourable meaning to their conduct.¹

The Protestants, on their side, were much divided as to the attitude that should be taken towards the conference. To the strict Lutherans organizations of this sort seemed to be equally preposterous and superfluous. From their point of view the old believers had nothing else to do but simply to accept the new "Evangelium" proclaimed by Luther. This was approximately the opinion of the Saxon Elector and his theologians. The Landgrave of Hesse, having a diplomatic turn of mind, thought otherwise. Constantly under the influence of the slippery Bucer, he was again once more in favour of a certain amount of compliancy.

The opening of the Council of Trent threw the Protestantizers into no small perplexity. They had to choose now between participation in the Council or in the new conference on religion; they decided for the latter as being in their opinion the lesser evil of the two. Consequently, on the 17th of September the Elector of Saxony came to an agreement with the Landgrave that Melancthon, Bucer, Schnepf, and Brenz should be spokesmen; the Elector nevertheless was indisposed towards the conference. He and his theologians were fully determined to prevent any

¹ Cf. PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 305 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, *Karl V.*, IV., 465 *seq.*; PAULUS, *Hoffmeister*, 198 *seq.*; SPAHN, *Cochläus*, 306; POSTINA, *Billick*, 82 *seq.* V. AMERBACH is an exception; in his work, *Præcipuae Constit. Caroli Magni* (Ingolst., 1545), he expresses a hope that Charles V. would be successful in terminating the religious schism in Germany.

agreement being reached at Ratisbon. At a later date Melanchthon's place was taken by Major.¹

The conference opened on the 27th of January 1546, and there at once arose an unpleasant wrangle over matters of form. The actual proceedings began on the 5th of February with a speech from Malvenda which raised a protest from the opposite side. By order of the Emperor the fourth article of the Confession of Augsburg, on justification, was to be discussed first at the conference. Malvenda unfolded the Catholic view; Bucer replied to him from the 6th to the 11th of February. From the 12th to the 17th Billick spoke; he was opposed on the two following days by the Protestant theologians. From the 19th to the 22nd the debates were carried on "without notes or memoranda."

The speeches of the Catholic delegates, with whom on this occasion no representative of the middle party was present, breathed a very different spirit from those of five years ago. The semi-Lutheran doctrine of justification, then supported by Gropper, was now energetically rejected; the spirit of the Catholic revival was distinctly perceptible. The Protestant theologians had great difficulty in establishing Luther's doctrine of justification and in adducing as proofs on their side such Bible texts as the Catholic theologians had used on theirs. Not even an approximation, far less an accord, was reached between them. It was clearly recognized that this was not, as had been asserted at the conference in 1541, a mere logomachy, the misunderstandings of which might be cleared away with ease, but a controversy involving two conceptions of the most important doctrine of Christianity, which at the

¹ Cf. DÖLLINGER, *Reformation*, III., 323 *seq.*; PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 307 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, *Karl V.*, IV., 468 *seq.*; POSTINA, *Billick*, 83 *seq.*; HASENCLEVER, *Politik der Schmalkaldner*, 219-228.

innermost core were diverse and irreconcilable. It was not, however, this consciousness of the fact which was decisive for the further course of the debate, but the publication on the 26th of February of an Imperial edict binding the disputants on oath to observe secrecy as to their transactions, in order to put a stop to unjustified attempts at interference from without. This reasonable and well-meant ordinance was welcomed by the Protestant party as an opportunity for recalling their representatives and thus bringing the conference to an end. On the 20th of March the Saxons departed after handing in a protestation. In spite of the most imploring entreaties on the part of the Presidents, the remainder of the party followed, appealing to the commands of their rulers. Even the gentle Pflug wrote at the time to Gropper that the repulsive and odious behaviour of the Protestants had nullified the conference, although the Emperor called it together at the urgent request of the opponents themselves.¹

At the same time the Protestants had published two long memoirs in which they rejected the Tridentine Council and therefore demanded a free council, open to all Christians in common and without party, in a German city, to which the Emperor should summon not only the clergy but also the laity.² These declarations were peculiarly fitted to dispel any illusions as to the absolutely negative attitude of the Protestants towards the Council of Trent. The Landgrave Philip expressed himself in the

¹ Cf. DÖLLINGER, *Reformation*, III., 325 *seq.*; LÄMMER, *Vortrid. Theol.*, 198; PASTOR, *loc. cit.*, 314-344; HEYD, III., 323 *seq.*; BAUM, *Capito und Butzer*, 607 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, *Karl V.*, IV., 472; PAULUS, *Hoffmeister*, 207 *seq.*; SPAHN, *Cochläus*, 307 *seq.*; POSTINA, *Billick*, 86-90; *Archiv für Ref.-Gesch.*, V., 1 *seq.*, 375 *seq.*, and CÄMMERER'S (Berlin, 1901) *Dissertation*.

² See WALCH, XVII., 1112 *seq.*, 1152 *seq.*; MENZEL, II., 443 *seq.*

same sense in an interview which he had at Spires at the end of March with the Emperor. When Philip also met the Emperor's request that he should attend the forthcoming Diet with a qualified promise,¹ this certainly was not likely to allay the Emperor's displeasure at the Landgrave's behaviour.²

Charles thereupon made haste to reach Ratisbon, arriving there on the 10th of April 1546. His experience at the Diet there, as well as the outcome of the religious conference, could not but confirm him in his opinion that all pacific negotiations were in vain, and that nothing now remained but the appeal to arms.³

In Rome the Emperor's conduct had been watched with strained attention. He was as much as ever an object of distrust and suspected of playing a double game. The feeling in curial circles is described in a letter from Bishop Giovio to Duke Cosimo of Florence of the 18th of February 1546. "Never," he says, "will the Emperor's sword be drawn in reality against the Lutherans; such an undertaking would be too perilous and unbecoming his sagacity. Charles will so comport himself at Ratisbon as to win over the Protestants and secure their friendship in order to make use of them in his schemes against France."⁴

The Imperial ambassador Vega believed for his part that the Pope at heart was opposed to the wars against the Protestants. Paul III., he advised, should be taken

¹ See HASENCLEVER, *Die Politik Karl V., und des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen vor Ausbruch des Schmalkald. Krieges*, Marburg, 1903, 39 *seq.*

² *Cf.* Commentaires, 117.

³ *Cf.* RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, IV., 6th ed., 287, 296 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 617 *seq.*; Venet. Depeschen, I., 480.

⁴ DRUFFEL, *Karl V.*, IV., 533.

on his weakest side and gained by hopes of the aggrandizement of the Farnesi.¹

Marquina reached Rome again on the 23rd of February 1546. His instructions were that the Emperor agreed to the conditions imposed by the Pope, but was not yet ready to ratify the treaty.² This fresh delay must, together with renewed attempts at friendly negotiations with the Protestants, have disquieted the Pope intensely.³ Paul III.'s irritation at Charles was heightened still more by the want of consideration for his wishes and interests shown by the Imperialists in other matters. Quite apart from the interminable disputes over Spanish prize claims and Neapolitan tenths, there was a catalogue of grievances of other sorts: there was the Pragmatic question, the Emperor's demand that the Colonna should be reinstated, his attitude towards the matrimonial projects which were being forged for Vittoria Farnese, Pier Luigi's daughter; lastly, the question of the suzerainty over Parma and Piacenza.⁴ A statement made by Granvelle in April to Buoncambi, Pier Luigi's agent, left no doubt that Charles held steadfastly to his Imperial rights over both these cities.⁵

For a long time the relations between Pope and Emperor were materially influenced by the violent disputes into which Paul III. was drawn with his old opponent Cosimo de' Medici.

The hostility of Cosimo to the Pope of the house of Farnese, whose intercourse with the Florentine exiles

¹ See Vega's report of March 12, 1546, in MAURENBRECHER, 69*; cf. Nuntiaturlberichte, VIII., 571, n. 2.

² Cf. Vega's report of March 30, in MAURENBRECHER, 69*-70*.

³ Cf. DRUFFEL, IV., 483; Nuntiaturlberichte, VIII., 471, n. 3.

⁴ Cf. Nuntiaturlberichte, VIII., 43, 56, 488 n., 489 n., 510, 524, 572, 590.

⁵ See AFFÒ, 109 *seq.*

seemed suspicious, was constantly fanned into flame by Cardinal Accolti, who was resident in Florence, and against whom Paul III. had sworn vengeance. This dangerous man busied himself with the most perverse schemes. In the summer of 1542, when the relations between Pope and Emperor were of extreme delicacy, he laid before Charles V. a detailed plan whereby Paul III. might be struck to the heart. The Emperor was to make himself master of Rome, put an end to the temporal power of the Pope, and once more assert the rights of the Empire.¹ In order to give Accolti an assured position, Cosimo in the autumn of 1543 had succeeded in obtaining his appointment as ambassador from Charles to Florence.² When the Pope thereupon uttered threats, Cosimo let Accolti know that he need have no fear, as he could easily obtain help from the Duke of Urbino, Ascanio Colonna, the Abbot of Farfa, and the Perugians. He refused unconditionally to give up Accolti, while in the dispute on tenths in the spring of 1545 he agreed to a compromise.³ But immediately afterwards the question of the reform of the very decadent convents of Florence gave rise to fresh misunderstandings with Rome.⁴

Cosimo was a bitter enemy of the Dominicans of S. Marco. He complained that in remembrance of Savonarola they nourished republican tendencies and supported the opposition to the Medici. By a stroke of arbitrary power they were made an end of at one blow; on the 31st of August 1545 the Dominicans were expelled from S. Marco, S. Domenico at Fiesole, and S. Maria Maddalena at Mugnone because they had secretly har-

¹ DESJARDINS, III., 25 *seq.*

² COSTANTINI, 402 *seq.*

³ LUPO GENTILE, *Politica*, 92 *seq.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, 93 *seq.*

boured the exiles. The representations and complaints of the Pope at this proceeding were repudiated by Cosimo through his representative in the sharpest manner. Paul III. therefore brought before consistory in November a brief addressed to Cosimo threatening him with excommunication if within three days of notification he did not reinstate the Dominicans who had been driven forth without form or trial. This time Cosimo gave in. The Dominicans were allowed to return, but the envoy Del Caccia was recalled from Rome.¹ Only an agent named Francesco Babbi remained behind.

By March 1546 the quarrel between Rome and Florence was again in a blaze. The Dominicans of S. Marco complained that Cosimo had forbidden any alms to be expended on the convent. Paul III. thereupon, on the 15th of March, made a strong protest, and Babbi, who lodged with the Imperial ambassador, was put under arrest. For this the latter also now made a remonstrance. Cosimo, however, wrote a letter of justification to the College of Cardinals. Angry as Charles was at the Pope's severe proceeding, he yet counselled the Duke to show moderation, since a war between Rome and Florence would have been destructive of his plans in Germany. Vega exerted himself to bring about an agreement, which was reached in April.²

From the remonstrances to Cosimo, as well as from other sources, it is evident that the war against the Protestants formed the central point of the Emperor's policy.³

¹ LUPO GENTILE, *Politica*, 97-102. Cf. MONDAINI, *La Storia di G. B. Adriani*, Firenze, 1905, 31 *seqq.*

² By a brief of April 9, 1546, Paul III. asked the Duke to sanction the collection of alms, which the latter at once agreed to (see LUPO GENTILE, *Politica*, 114-115).

³ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, VIII., 57.

Paul III. was in error when he doubted the Emperor's sincerity in this undertaking. But the Pope's apprehensions admit of explanation, since Charles even after his entry into Ratisbon continued to put off the signature of the treaty. The Emperor then disclosed to the nuncio Verallo that he must first obtain King Ferdinand's consent and know for certain what the Pope's concessions from the revenues of the Spanish Church would amount to. When the latter had come in, Charles declared that he could not sign the treaty until King Ferdinand had arrived. Verallo, who was unable to obtain any clue to the labyrinthine policy of the Emperor,¹ went through a painful time. Week after week went by and still no decision was reached; again and again it was reiterated that the Pope must still have patience. Verallo and Cardinal Truchsess were of opinion that Cardinal Farnese should appear once more in order to make all things clear. Farnese declined at first to undertake the journey, as he did not know whether his coming was wished for, and it seemed to all appearance as if the Emperor intended to give up the war.² At the beginning of May 1546 the outlook began at last to improve. Soto then informed Verallo that Charles, since King Ferdinand delayed his coming, only awaited the arrival of Duke William of Bavaria before ratifying the treaty. On the 6th of May Verallo wrote that the Emperor was altered and seemed now to think seriously of the war. In his subsequent despatches also he was able to report indications of a more favourable aspect of affairs. In the middle of May, Granvelle and Soto announced the prospect of a speedy decision, but still counselled reserve and close secrecy for yet a while longer. On the 18th Verallo had an audience of the Emperor, who still seemed

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., vii.

² *Ibid.*, IX., 8 seq., 11 seq., 21, 26, 29.

as determined as ever to let things drift and to avoid the appearance of openly avowed measures.¹

When afterwards, on the 21st of May, Cardinal Madruzzo arrived in Ratisbon, a termination seemed at last to be assured. To his astonishment Verallo now found himself excluded from the negotiations which were taking place. Together with Madruzzo, Cardinal Truchsess was, on the other hand, admitted. As the nuncio subsequently was informed, Charles V. was ready to sign the treaty of alliance in exact conformity with the second draft, but Madruzzo was bidden to lay before the Pope a further series of demands. Before all, the Emperor wished the Pope to make a special agreement binding himself in case of necessity to supply troops for a longer period, if possible up to the end of the war, or at least for a period of certainly eight months. He also asked for a further extension of the time, fixed in the original draft as six months from the finish of the campaign, for taking steps against disturbers of the military operations, *i.e.* the French. Charles hoped thus in a circuitous way to compass what he had earlier striven for in vain for years, a permanent alliance with the Pope against Francis. The old wish that the Papal subsidy should be raised from 200,000 to 300,000 ducats was again expressed. Further demands included the Pope's permission to levy a half of the ecclesiastical revenues of the Netherlands, an appeal for more vigorous support from the Catholic Estates, especially the bishops, and the payment of the war funds, not in Augsburg and Venice, but in Ratisbon and Trent; finally, the Legatine dignity for the war was asked for Cardinal Madruzzo, the negotiator, and for Cardinal Farnese.²

¹ See Verallo's letters in the Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 31 *seq.*, 34 *seq.*, 40 *seq.*, 42 *seq.*, 44 *seq.*

² Nuntiaturberichte, IX., ix-x.

By the beginning of June all this was settled. Still a whole week went by before the treaty was signed. The cause of this fresh and final delay was that the negotiations with Bavaria lasted longer than Charles had expected. To gain the support of this power seemed to the Emperor an indispensable preliminary to his great undertaking. He thus secured a base of operations within the Empire, an arsenal and a provision store for the war.¹ On the 7th of June 1546 a treaty was made in closest secrecy between Charles V., Ferdinand I., and Duke William of Bavaria. The last-named undertook to supply 10,000 gold gulden, to place a great portion of his artillery with ammunition at the Emperor's disposal, and to maintain the Imperialist troops at a moderate cost in his territories.²

On the same day on which this compact was agreed to the Emperor summoned Verallo to his presence and with exhortations to profound silence initiated him into the secret of his arrangements with Bavaria and Madruzzo, and declared himself ready to ratify the treaty with the Pope. With Verallo standing by, Charles affixed his signature to the document, dated the 6th of June.³ The treaty ran thus: "As Germany for many years, to its grievous hurt and in peril of total ruin, has been disturbed by erroneous teaching, and all remedies have proved fruitless, a General Council has assembled itself in Trent, the decisions of which are now rejected by the Protestants and the Schmalkaldic League. The Pope and Emperor have therefore determined to combine in the following alliance for the glory of

¹ See RIEZLER, *Gesch. Bayerns*, IV., 342.

² *Ibid.*, 339 *seq.*

³ See Verallo's *letter of June 7, 1546, and that of Cardinal Truchsess of June 9, both to Farnese, in *Nuntiatrberichte*, IX., 65 *seq.*, 71 *seq.* The original treaty with the signature of Charles V. is in the Secret Archives of the Vatican (*Nunz. di Germania sotto Paolo III.*, Vol. 3) (*cf. Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, IX., 135).

God and the salvation of Christendom : The Emperor binds himself, after all friendly means have been unavailing, in the next month of June, with the aid of the Pope, to open war against the Protestants, the Schmalkaldic League, and other German teachers of error, in order to bring them back to the true and ancient religion, and to the obedience of the Holy See. The Emperor further binds himself, not, without the express consent of his Holiness or the Apostolic Legate, to make any terms of agreement with the above-named false teachers which can affect the reason and object of the present undertaking, or injure or prejudice its progress and success, and in particular to refrain from any concessions in matters of religion and the constitution of the Church. The Pope promises, within a month from the conclusion of the treaty, to deposit 100,000 ducats in Venice, which, with the 100,000 ducats at Augsburg, shall be spent exclusively by the commissaries of his Holiness on the purposes of the war. The Pope also engages to place, at his own charges, under the command of a Legate and necessary officers, 12,000 Italian infantry and 500 light horsemen as auxiliary troops for six months, or up to the close of the campaign if it should be of shorter duration. He consents, in addition, to set apart for the war, for one year, half the ecclesiastical revenues of Spain, with a further 500,000 ducats from the sale of conventual property. During the undertaking, and for six months afterwards, the contracting parties pledge themselves to render mutual assistance, should one or other of them be molested by a third party. Entrance into the alliance, which is to be confirmed by the Sacred College, lies open to the Catholic Estates of Germany, and to all Christian powers in general.”¹

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 575-578. A copy of the Imperial version of the treaty also in Cod. Barb., LVI., 107, f. 116 *seq.*, Vatican Library.

Cardinal Madruzzo was to deliver the treaty as ratified by Charles to the Pope, and to be the spokesman of the Emperor's further wishes. About midnight on the 7th-8th of June, Aurelio Cattaneo, the Cardinal's secretary, started for Rome to announce beforehand his master's coming. Madruzzo himself left early on the morning of the 8th, with such speed that he did not wait a moment for the documents requisite for his mission. These were conveyed by an Imperial courier on the 10th of June to the ambassador Vega.¹

Verallo's reports from the 1st to the 4th of June, which reached Rome on the 9th, finally dispelled the doubts which had never ceased to prevail in the Curia of the Emperor's firm intention of beginning the war. Cattaneo arrived on the evening of the 13th, followed on the 18th by the courier, whereupon Vega made haste to see the Pope. On the evening of the 19th of June Cardinal Madruzzo's arrival was also announced. He was received at once on the following morning, together with Vega, by the Pope. Paul III. seized this opportunity to complain of the long delay, and to bring up his old grievances against Charles V. : the keeping back of the Imperial recognition of Pier Luigi as Duke of Parma and Piacenza, the disputes over prize cases in Spain, the tenths in Naples, and the maintenance of the Pragmatic. Madruzzo was not slow in offering tranquillizing assurances on all these points.²

As the consent of the Cardinals was one of the express

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 69, n. 1 ; Venet. Depeschen, I., 520 ; *cf.* KANNENGIESSER, Karl V. und Maximilian Egmont, Graf von Büren, Freiburg, 1895, 135 *seq.* The credentials prepared by Charles V. for Madruzzo and Vega, dated June 10, 1546, are given in Arch. Stor. Ital., 4th Series, XIX., 442 *seq.*

² See DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 580 *seq.* ; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 88, n. 1 ; *cf. ibid.*, xi.

conditions of the alliance, the treaty had to be laid before a general congregation. This took place on the 22nd of June in the palace of S. Marco, the summer residence of the Pope. The French and Venetian Cardinals raised such strong opposition that Paul III. found himself compelled to intervene personally in the discussion. He was supported in particular by Madruzzo, who was a warm advocate of the war. The opposition's chief objection was to the sale of the Spanish Church property; at last it was generally agreed that this point should be allowed to drop, the Pope being left to his own discretion to find out some other equivalent. The treaty thereupon was accepted unanimously.¹ In drafting the document, the alteration above mentioned was not taken into consideration, in order to avoid any fresh delay, only, at the end of the treaty a supplementary note was added that by the June named as the future starting-point of the campaign the current month of June 1546 was meant. In this form the document was signed on the 26th of June by Paul III. in the presence of Madruzzo and Vega.² The day before, Cardinal Farnese had been nominated in a consistory *Legatus a latere* to the Emperor and the army.³ On July the 4th a solemn ceremony took place in the Church of S. Maria in Aracoeli,

¹ Together with Maffei's report of June 23, 1546, first made use of by DE LEVA (IV., 67), see also the Acta Consist. and the other reports published by FRIEDENSBURG in the Nuntiatuerberichte, IX., 90, n. 1, as well as DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 565, 582. The news of the acceptance of the treaty in consistory reached Ratisbon on July 3, 1546 (see Venet. Depeschen, I., 561; *ibid.*, 677, for the attempts of the Venetian ambassador in Rome to influence the Cardinals against the treaty with Charles).

² See KANNENGIESSER, Die Kapitulation zwischen Karl V. und Paul III. (reprinted from the Festschrift des Protest. Gymnasiums zu Strasbourg, 1888), 215 *seq.*; Nuntiatuerberichte, IX., 576-578.

³ See Acta Consist. in the Nuntiatuerberichte, IX., 90, n. 1.

when Cardinal Farnese received the Legatine cross, and Ottavio Farnese was appointed commander-in-chief of the army and received the marshal's staff and the standard of war "against the Lutherans."¹ The most complete arrangements for the conveyance of the subsidies and the equipment of the troops were made at once.² There was all the greater necessity for despatch as the Emperor was placed in a position of great difficulty.

Charles V. had from the beginning surveyed the coming events with the greatest circumspection. In a confidential letter to his sister Maria, of the 9th of June 1546, he described the situation as one that was most favourable to him. "The war against the Duke of Brunswick has drained the Protestant finances. In Saxony and Hesse the greatest discontent prevails both among the nobles and the other subjects, who are tired of being kept in grinding poverty and bitterest serfdom. Then the Protestants are split up into different sects, and ample help is promised by the Pope. Further, I have hopes even of inducing some of the Protestant princes, such as Maurice of Saxony and Albert of Brandenburg, to submit in matters of religion to the Council." He intended accordingly to begin the war by attacking the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse as destroyers of the public peace, and to justify his action by their conduct towards the Duke of Brunswick. Even if this pretext, he thought, did not prevent his opponents from thinking that the war was one of religion, yet it was through this pretext in any case that he would cut them off.³

¹ See Acta Consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1546, n. 105, and also other sources in the Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 98, n. 1; CASIMIRO, Aracoeli, 328, must also be added.

² Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, IX., xiv *seq.*, 97 *seq.*, 104 *seq.*

³ LANZ, II., 486 *seq.*

At the same time, this first reckoning was to some extent mistaken. The Emperor certainly won over by secret agreements Duke Maurice of Saxony, the Margraves Hans of Brandenburg-Cüstrin and Albert of Brandenburg-Culmbach, and also secured the neutrality of the Elector Palatine and the Elector of Brandenburg; but South Germany remained true to the Schmalkaldic League, and armed with such rapidity that they might have forestalled Charles's attack. Even before war was declared, the Emperor found himself in Ratisbon already in serious danger from his enemies. While his troops lay at great distances in the Netherlands, Italy, and Hungary, or were gathering at the recruiting grounds of South Germany, the foe already had at his disposal in the immediate neighbourhood squadrons and regiments fit to take the field.

But the incapacity of the Schmalkaldic League was still greater than its strength. In the Commentaries, in which Charles enumerates with satisfaction the defects of his enemies, he speaks of them as if God had smitten them with blindness.¹

As a matter of fact, the Schmalkaldic forces in the first weeks of the war might easily have obtained the victory if they had only understood in any degree how to avail themselves of the exceptionally great advantages of the situation. Their complete self-deception with regard to the attitude of Bavaria was of most momentous import to them. For long they never once suspected that Duke William IV. was in alliance with the Emperor, and even later never realized it with perfect certainty. They trusted Chancellor Eck that Bavaria would remain neutral and keep watch to see on which side fortune was leaning.² In

¹ Commentaires, 127.

² See RIEZLER, *Gesch. Bayerns*, IV., 350, 353, 354.

consequence the bold dash of the first detachment of the Oberland Leaguers, led by Schärtlin von Burtenbach and Schankwitz, was a failure. Their plan was to fall upon the Imperialist mustering-places in Upper Suabia, to seize the passes of the Tyrol, thus cutting off the Emperor's communications with Italy, and afterwards even to make a raid on the Council at Trent. On the 9th of July Schärtlin had already taken Füssen, but durst not follow up the Imperialists as they retired over the adjacent Bavarian frontier, since the order had come from Augsburg that they were not to push Bavaria into the arms of the enemy by a violation of the supposed neutrality of that power. Schankwitz on the night of July the 10th captured the strong Ehrenberger pass near Reutte, and afterwards had already pressed on to Lermoos when he also received counter-orders. The council of war at Ulm did not wish to anger Ferdinand, of whose neutrality they had hopes. As any further advance of Schärtlin's troops would become a source of danger to Ulm and Augsburg, he was obliged on July the 14th to fall back with all his forces.¹

The Schmalkaldic forces now turned their thoughts to an entire concentration of their military strength, to be followed by an advance on the Emperor, who was still sojourning in Ratisbon. On July the 20th Schärtlin joined forces with the Wurtembergers and took Donauwörth; during the 3rd and 4th of August the Saxons and Hessians came up to that city with the South German contingent. The approximate numbers of the Schmalkaldic army now amounted to 30,000 foot soldiers, 4600 horsemen, and

¹ Cf. LADURNER, *Der Einfall des Schmalkaldner in Tirol* (Archiv für Gesch. Tirols, I., 145 *seq.*); EDELHAAF, II., 467 *seq.*; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 627 *seq.* See also *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 109 *seq.*, 113 *seq.*, 117 *seq.*

about a hundred guns.¹ They greatly outnumbered the Imperialists.

Charles V. had made use of the breathing-space given him by his enemies, by gathering about him reinforcements. By the 3rd of August he thought that Ratisbon might be abandoned without danger. On the 4th he entered Landshut, where he hoped to effect a conjunction with the auxiliary troops called out of Italy. For the Schmalkaldic army everything depended on preventing this combination. But even this favourable opportunity for snatching victory was allowed to slip through their hands; not merely were they hindered at every step by consideration for Bavaria, but they were wanting in the self-sacrifice, spirit, and confidence which their cause demanded. Saxony and Hesse had brought no war funds; they thought they had done enough in adding their troops to those of the South Germans. The cities were getting tired of paying out moneys, and thought that the Word of God cost much too dear, that it would have been better to have stayed at home and come to some compact with the Emperor. When the hopes of foreign assistance proved illusory, the boastful assurances of victory with which they had started gave place to deep despondency. To the want of the necessary money, for which the plunder of churches and convents did not suffice, there was added the lack of unity among their leaders. What the impetuous Landgrave wished was displeasing to the slow-moving Elector; what Schärtlin von Burtenbach counselled was rejected by both.² Before the Schmalkaldic leaders had come to a decision, Charles

¹ See the investigations of LE MANG, *Die Darstellung der Schmalkaldischen Krieger in den Denkwürdigkeiten Karls V.*, I., Jena, 1890, 25, n. 7, 61, n. 1.

² Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 638 *seq.*

had joined hands with the expedition sent out of Italy by the Pope.¹

This consisted of 10,000 infantry and more than 700 light cavalry. The latter, with Giovanni Battista Savelli at their head, entered Landshut on the 7th of August; the infantry appeared three days later, but were so exhausted by the long march that a rest was imperative. The commander-in-chief, Ottavio Farnese, waited on Charles V. on the 11th of August, and was received with the utmost marks of respect; two days later the order of the Golden Fleece was conferred upon him. He afterwards paraded his troops before the Emperor, who was highly delighted with their eminently soldierly appearance. "The men," wrote Verallo to Rome, "have surpassed all our expectations."² By this accession of strength and other reinforcements Charles was now numerically superior to his enemies, against whom he now published the Ban dated the 20th of July.³

On the 26th of August Charles occupied a well-fortified camp on the plains before the Bavarian frontier fortress of Ingolstadt. The enemy directed their fire on city and camp, but did not venture on an open attack. Their retirement, which began on September the 4th, was in glaring contradiction to the bombastic and insulting language of the letter of defiance which they had just delivered to the Emperor. Thus in the moral scale also

¹ The French court had counted it a certainty that the Schmalkaldic League would prevent this; see the *letter of Bishop Dandino of Imola to the Cardinal Camerlengo, dat. Fontainebleau, Aug. 8, 1546, *Nunz. di Francia*, 2 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., xxii *seq.*, 186 *seq.*; *cf.* also Mocenigo in the *Fontes rer. Austr.*, XXX., 125 *seq.*, who criticises severely the choice of commanders (*cf.* p. 137). The names of all the captains of the Italian auxiliaries in *MANENTE*, 285 *seq.*

³ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 185, 197.

Charles was superior.¹ Failure also attended the attempt of the Schmalkaldic forces to cut off the supports coming to the Emperor from the Netherlands under the command of Maximilian Egmont, the Count of Büren. On the 15th of September Egmont's force joined that of the Emperor, who had now at his disposal over 50,000 infantry and 14,000 cavalry.² Notwithstanding his superiority, Charles was determined not to stake all on one throw; his plan was rather to keep the enemy in check and wear him out financially. The situation of the latter grew worse; the help which they had solicited from Denmark, France, and England never came, while even their strong hope that the Turks would open a way of relief to them was unfulfilled. The Emperor took Donauwörth, Dillingen, and Lauingen; the Schmalkaldic forces fell back until they took up their position about the middle of October in a fortified camp to the north of Ulm near Giengen. Here they remained inactive for six weeks while Charles lay encamped at Lauingen. Many fell victims on both sides to disease, the rough autumnal German weather telling with special severity on the unacclimatized Spaniards and Italians; the latter troops gradually melted away from sickness and desertion.³ The Emperor refused to be drawn into a battle; his dogged caution was to crown his banners with victory.

At the end of October a new aspect of the Emperor's widespread plans was disclosed. Duke Maurice of Saxony

¹ See RIEZLER in *Der Abhandl. der bayr. Akad. der Wissensch.*, XXI. (1895), 211; BEZOLD, 780; EGELHAAF, II., 470; LENZ in the *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXXVI., 467.

² Cf. KANNENGIESSER, *Karl V. und Maximilian Egmont, Graf von Büren*, Freiburg, 1895.

³ For the wholesale desertion of Italians on the departure of Cardinal Farnese, see *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 310, n. 1, 312, n. 2.

declared war against his cousin John Frederick, and put into execution the Ban which had been pronounced against him. It was not, however, by the Saxon catastrophe that the war was decided against the fortunes of the Schmalkaldic League, but by their financial necessities. "The promised French money," wrote Philip of Hesse, "did not come. Wurtemberg and the cities cannot and will not give any, Saxony and ourselves have none; therefore we must give in."¹ On the 23rd of November the confederates broke up at Giengen. The Landgrave made haste home through Wurtemberg "to his two wives," as Schärtlin scornfully remarked; the Elector plundered on his way back weak dependencies of the Empire, whether, like Gmünd, Mayence, and Fulda, they were Catholic, or, like Frankfort, Protestant.²

The retreat of the Schmalkaldic forces quite unexpectedly made the Imperialist troops, who from wet, cold, and sickness were in a very precarious position, masters of the field. The war on the Danube was brought to a victorious close without a battle, almost without a skirmish, through the circumspection and iron persistency of Charles, who had displayed throughout great tranquillity and confidence. Seldom was a contest begun on the one side with greater braggadocio and carried out with greater incompetency. The strange spectacle was witnessed of an army originally the stronger retreating without having struck a blow, finally separating and hurrying homewards in rapid flight.

Scarcely had the Emperor entered on his victory than the cities and princes of southern Germany began to compete in abject entreaties for grace and pardon. Charles V. for-

¹ ROMMEL, *Urkundenbuch*, 262-263; *cf.* EGELHAAF, II., 475 *seq.*; *Histor. Zeitschr.*, XXXVI., 76; LXXVII., 468.

² See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 648 *seq.*; *cf.* *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 364 *seq.*, 375.

gave, but he made the guilty pay roundly for the cost of war. In matters of religion he believed that at first in southern Germany general toleration must be observed.¹ This position, in which the Pope justly saw a violation of the treaty of June, was followed by other questions also which led afresh to serious breaches of amity with the Holy See.

¹ See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 650 *seq.* ; EGELHAAF, II., 477.

CHAPTER VIII.

DISSENSIONS BETWEEN PAUL III. AND CHARLES V.

THE insecurity of the foundations on which the friendship between Charles V. and Paul III. rested was shown by the circumstance that, while the signatures of the treaty of June 1546 were scarcely dry, fresh differences emerged. The old suspicions and exorbitant demands on the part of the Emperor raised barriers in all directions to a permanent understanding.

Charles V., in the first place, was offended that Paul III., in spite of the pleadings of Cardinal Madruzzo, would not consent to an extension in time of the obligations laid upon him by the treaty. Madruzzo, on the other hand, obtained the Pope's consent to the wishes of Charles with regard to the disbursement of the moneys in Trent and the attribution of the half of the ecclesiastical revenues of the Netherlands.¹ Nevertheless, the Emperor was not satisfied. From the first he had assiduously placed the political motives for his hostile action against the Protestants in the foreground, while endeavouring to veil, in fact to repudiate, the religious motives. Since there were cogent reasons for this behaviour, he could not but feel aggrieved that in Rome the ecclesiastical objects of the war in common were emphasized unceasingly, and in

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., xii *seq.*; *cf. ibid.*, 154, n. 1., the Bull, dated already Aug. 11, 1546, relating to the Church revenues of the Netherlands.

the briefs to the Kings of France and Poland, the Doge of Venice, the German archbishops and bishops, and the University of Louvain an open summons was given to a crusade against the German heretics.¹ In reply to this, however, the Pope could point out that Charles V. himself had demanded that the treaty should be discussed in consistory; and that the briefs, at the urgent request of the German ambassador, had been so discussed before they were sent off.² The Emperor's complaint that the treaty of June had been communicated to the Swiss Confederation was justified. In this way the German Protestants received authentic information concerning the object of the blow directed against them, and they did not hesitate to use the weapon placed in their hands to incite their co-religionists. The breach of confidence which this involved was inexcusable, and can only be explained on the assumption that Paul III., never free from suspicion, wished to make any agreement between Charles and the Protestants impossible.³

How little confidence was placed in the Emperor is evident from the fact that Verallo in the beginning of August 1546 recommended some consideration to be shown for his wishes in the affairs of the Council, since otherwise it was to be feared that some hurtful agreement might be made with the Protestants and Granvelle's threat of a national council be carried out.⁴ Under these cir-

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1546, n. 58 *seq.*, and Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 98, n. 2, 122.

² See Farnese's letters in Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 457, 465 *seq.* That the Protestants must have become aware of the alliance through the discussions in consistory is insisted upon by BROSCHE in the *Mitteil. des Österr. Instituts*, XXIII., 136. *Cf.* also DE LEVA, IV., 159.

³ *Cf.* JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 622; KANNENGIESSER, *Die Kapitulation zwischen Karl V. und Paul III.*, 23 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., xxxii.

⁴ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 172.

cumstances the nuncio and his master in Rome looked with misgiving on the cautious policy of Charles and his attempts to win over a portion of his adversaries by concessions.

The Pope's distrust, eagerly fomented by the French,¹ was in reality not unjustified, for the guarantees in matters of religion by which Duke Maurice of Saxony, the Margraves Hans von Brandenburg-Cüstrin and Albert of Brandenburg-Culmbach were gained, could not be brought into accord with the treaty of June.² If Paul III. had heard of these agreements at once he might then have complained with much greater right of the non-fulfilment of the treaty, as Charles did with regard to the immediate payment of the war funds. The difficulties in this connection, as well as those regarding the compensation for the alienation of the Spanish Church property objected to by the Cardinals, were removed in essential points by the arrival of Farnese accredited as Cardinal-Legate to the forces. He was not, however, in a position to prevent further disputes over the management of the Italian auxiliaries and delays in their payment.³

Farnese, who had his first audience on arrival on the 24th of August 1546, also presented to the Emperor the Bull agreeing to the conveyance of the half of the ecclesiastical revenues of the Netherlands. Charles V. thanked him, but declined to comply with the Legate's request of the 29th of August that he would openly declare the war to be a religious one. With regard to a series of minor contentions the Emperor promised redress.⁴ He did not, however, go beyond fair words. The pettiness of Charles

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 107, n. 1.

² Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 622-624.

³ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., xxx seq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 205 seq., 212 seq.

in shelving any arrangement in matters of trifling consequence caused an annoyance which was all the more bitter as the Pope was conscious that in all primary points he had discharged his heavy obligations.

Paul III. and his family had to learn that the hopes which they had cherished of greater consideration on the Emperor's part for their private wishes were not in the way of realization. The disappointment was all the greater as they had reckoned on the Emperor's gratitude for the very substantial assistance brought to him at a most critical moment by the Papal troops.¹ Instead of this, Granvelle came forward with reiterated complaints of the communication of the treaty to the Swiss. Charles V., however, showed himself only too much inclined to lay the personal responsibility for the daily grievances arising among the Italian soldiery on the Pope himself, who, he thought, was intentionally causing him difficulties in all directions.²

The extraordinary distrust with which the two heads of Christendom regarded each other, although the general situation demanded imperatively the best understanding, received its worst illustration in their mutual attitude over the affairs of the Council.

The war between the Emperor and the Schmalkaldic League was bound to react upon the Synod in session at Trent. The news of the capture of the Ehrenberger pass by Schärtlin von Burtenbach had caused such terror in that

¹ Cf. in Appendix, No. 31, Cardinal G. Gonzaga's *letter of July 23, 1546 (Vatican Library).

² See *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., xxi, 227. Friedensburg observes on the mutual distrust of Charles V. and Paul III.: "Neither of the two trusted the other; each stood suspiciously on his guard and scrutinized closely the steps of his partner, always anxious lest the latter should gain an advantage over him, and therefore disinclined to make any concession above and beyond what was absolutely necessary."

city that many of the Fathers thought of immediate flight.¹ On July the 15th, 1546, as the doctrine of justification had now undergone thorough examination, four bishops were appointed in the general congregation to draw up the decree on that subject. The discussion then proceeded, in the course of which Cardinal Pacheco spoke. But when it came to the turn of Archbishop Jacopo Cauco of Corfu, the latter declared that he had not supposed that they would be discussing justification that day, but more probably, in view of the danger from the war, a removal or a suspension of the Council. The Archbishops of Siena and Matera² also dwelt upon the danger. The Legates themselves, in a letter of the 25th of June 1546 to Cardinal Farnese, had called attention to the distressing situation of the Council. They said it was neither decorous nor without danger to remain so close to the assembling of troops and fanatical enemies. There were no means in Trent of repelling an attack threatened by friends of the Lutheran party in the Grisons, an attack which was all the more sure of success as that canton had sympathizers in Trent itself, Verona, Vicenza, and other neighbouring places. But even the soldiery who were friendly to them would be burdensome owing to the decreasing supply of provisions; they covered the country like hordes of locusts; an assembly of defenceless clergy would be in a sad plight under such circumstances. It seemed at the least a hard demand to make upon them that amid such anxieties they should devote their attention to conciliar deliberations.³

The Pope, however, was not at all well pleased with the Legates' suggestion that the seat of the Council should be removed. The Emperor had repeatedly made known his

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 560.

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 89; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. 8, c. 5.

³ DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 566; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. 8, c. 5.

wish that the Council during the war should under any circumstances continue assembled in Trent.¹ Paul III. was determined not to embroil himself at any price with Charles over this question at the very moment when he had entered into alliance with him to bring the Protestants into forcible submission to the Council. The Legates therefore received orders to remain in Trent, and to proceed with the deliberations. How disagreeable such instructions were is shown by a letter from Cervini to the Papal secretary Maffei of the 8th of July. Cervini declared that he bowed to the Pope's will, but expressed his fear that the time might come when it would be the business of the mail-clad Emperor to prescribe to the Council the course of its proceedings. Yet the Pope held fast by his determination, once for all expressed, that he would not for a moment consent to the proposal of the Legates that the sessions should be suspended on account of the approaching passage of troops;² on the other hand, he was not willing to meet the further wish of the Emperor, who was still pressing for a cessation of the dogmatic discussions. As long as the Synod in Trent remained open, it must continue, in accordance with the Pope's wishes, to carry out its tasks fully.

On the 21st of July Paul gave instructions to Cardinal Farnese, then on his way to join as Legate the Imperial army, that he might represent to Charles, if the latter demanded the avoidance of dogmatic questions, that such an interruption of the activities of the Council would only then be possible if the Council were transferred to some other spot.³

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., xxxiii, 70.

² PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 5.

³ See Cardinal Santaflora's letter to Farnese of July 21, 1546, in Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 135 *seq.* On July 23 the same Cardinal wrote
VOL. XII.

The timorous Cervini again broached the subject of removal when Cardinal Farnese as Legate passed through the southern Tyrol with the Papal troops. Farnese's illness at Rovereto gave Cervini an opportunity of discussing the matter with him thoroughly. As Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga informed Camillo Capilupi, Cervini set before the Legate in such vivid colours the danger of Charles becoming supreme over the Council, as he would be supreme in the approaching war, that Farnese was won over to the proposal for a removal of the Council, and in that sense reported to Rome.¹ It seems that hopes were entertained there that Charles might be induced to give his consent to a removal. This certainly was not to be thought of now; Charles clung to his determination that the Council should be a dummy to serve as a prop for his scheme of policy. If the Pope thought that this was more than he could consent to, his reasons were not difficult to understand. It would be beneath his dignity and a thing impossible in itself to require the Fathers of the Council to regulate their conduct by the dilatory course of German affairs and sit idle in Trent squandering time and money until the cast of the iron dice should have decided the Schmalkaldic war.²

As Cardinal Cervini was lingering by the sick-bed of Farnese in Rovereto and Pole had gone on already on the 28th of June to recuperate his feeble health at again that the Pope consented to a translation, but only in case of necessity, and if a continuance at Trent was actually impossible. In case too long a time would be required to enable him personally to make the necessary representations to the Emperor, he gave permission to send a prelate of high standing to Charles V., entrusted with this task. Ferrara and Lucca were to be proposed to the Emperor as suitable places (*ibid.*, IX., 141 *seq.*).

¹ Cf. Cardinal E. Gonzaga's *letter to C. Capilupi of Aug. 13, 1546, Cod. Barb. Lat., 5793, f. 157^b, Vatican Library.

² Cf. EHSES in the Röm. Quartalschr., XIX., 182.

Padua,¹ Cardinal del Monte was left the sole President of the Council. His position was not an enviable one. Seeing that the Pope was opposed to any postponement of the sittings, he had proposed in the general congregation of the 28th of July to hold the session and there publish the dogmatic decree as it stood. Pacheco, on the contrary, with the almost unanimous consent of the Fathers, asked for a postponement of the session, and that too contrary to the view taken by del Monte that the prorogation should be indefinite. In opposition to Pacheco, the Archbishops of Corfù and Matera, Cauco and Saraceni, declared themselves in favour of a translation of the Council. The former remarked that to stay in Trent under the existing conditions was to tempt Providence and to inflict great indignity on the whole Church ; moreover, he had no doubt that if the Emperor were informed of the true state of affairs he certainly would be the first to approve of a removal of the Council to some safer place. At these words he was violently interrupted by Cardinal Pacheco exclaiming : " Speak to the business in hand, and do not digress upon the intentions of the Emperor, of which you know nothing." Cardinal del Monte, to whom the Archbishop's utterance of opinion had been by no means displeasing, refrained from calling the latter to order, and thereby brought on a passage of words between himself and Pacheco. The latter displayed no little excitement. Some of the Spanish bishops emulated him in violence of language, and it taxed the Legate to the utmost to restore calm.² In a

¹ As Pole's illness was protracted he was released on Oct. 27, 1546, from his Legatine duties and recalled to Rome (PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 7). It is certain that then, and for some time longer, Pole was in very bad health owing to the climate of Trent (see REUMONT in Theol. Literaturbl., 1870, 997).

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, l., 95-97 ; PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 7.

letter of July the 29th the conciliar Legates represented to Verallo that, in view of the war, a removal of the Council seemed advisable, as otherwise it was to be feared that it might dissolve itself. They named as suitable places Ferrara or Lucca.¹

On the 30th of July the general congregation continued the discussion of the decree on justification. At the close of the sitting Pacheco again demanded the appointment of a fixed day for the next sitting. As del Monte, who was again sole President, opposed him, the Imperialist Cardinals Madruzzo and Pacheco attacked him in the most reckless fashion. Madruzzo allowed himself to go so far as to accuse del Monte of conduct unbecoming a Christian, taunting him at last on his plebeian origin. The assembly broke up amid great excitement without having come to any decision.²

This outburst on the part of the Imperialists was exactly calculated to precipitate what, in the interests of Charles V., they wished to prevent. Del Monte, deeply chagrined at the contempt of his authority, was now more than ever in favour of a removal of the Council from Trent, where the authority of an Imperial master seemed to be quite as dangerous as the peril from foreign enemies. Madruzzo himself perceived that his anger had carried him too far; Cervini, on his return from Rovereto on the 31st of July, made warm representations to him. The incident was also made the subject of conversation with the Cardinal-Legate Farnese, who arrived in Trent on the 2nd of August. The result was surprising. On the 3rd of August Bishop Pietro Bertano of Fano, as representing not the Council but the Legates only, yet with the approval of Madruzzo and Pacheco, was sent to the Imperial court with the object of

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 155 *seq.*

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 98-100; PALLAVICINI, I. 8, c. 7.

favourably disposing Charles to the removal of the Council to Ferrara, Lucca, or Siena.¹ On the following day Achille de' Grassi was despatched to Rome to inform the Pope more thoroughly of the state of affairs. Bertano did not get far. In Brixen he met Aurelio Cattaneo, secretary to the Cardinal of Trent, returning from the Emperor's court. From him he received so vivid an account of the irritation shown by Charles at the proposal to translate the Council² that he was convinced of the futility of his mission and on August the 4th turned back to Trent. De' Grassi also was recalled thither by a special messenger, to be again sent forth on the 6th of August with the most recent information. He was the bearer of a letter to the Pope from Cervini, dated August the 5th, containing a report of the threatening language in which the Emperor had inveighed against him.³ At the same time the Legates forwarded to Verallo a document of the 5th of August exculpating themselves, and Cervini in particular, from the charge of endeavouring to bring about the dissolution of the Council.⁴ On the 7th of August Bertano also left for Rome, sent by Madruzzo.⁵

¹ His instructions are in Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 589 *seq.*

² Massarelli, Diarium, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 565. For the Emperor's anger and his repeated threats of vengeance on Cervini, whom he considered the chief culprit in the matter of the translation of the Council, *cf.* also Verallo's reports: to Farnese, July 30, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 163 *seq.*); to the Legates, July 31 (*ibid.*, 163 *seq.*, n.); to Santaflora, Aug. 7 (*ibid.*, 177 *seq.*; here an utterance of Granvelle is reported repeating the threat of a national council). On Aug. 12 Mendoza spoke to the Legates about the Emperor's temper (Massarelli, Diarium, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 566).

³ *Cf.* Massarelli, Diarium, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 565; PALLAVICINI, I. 8, c. 8, n. 3; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 179 *seq.*, n. 4. Besides Cervini's letter to the Pope of Aug. 5 (not 15), *cf.* Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 163, n. 2; MERKLE, I., 567, n. 1.

⁴ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 590-592.

⁵ Massarelli, Diarium, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 566.

In the meantime, on the night of August the 7th, Montemerlo, Farnese's secretary, had arrived in Trent. He brought to the Legates, together with a letter from Cardinal Santaflora of the 3rd and 4th of August, in which Lucca was recommended, a Bull dated the 1st of August 1546 conveying full powers, in the case of prolonged continuance in Trent becoming impossible, to translate the Synod to some more suitable place with the consent of the Fathers or of a majority.¹

Montemerlo was also authorized to show a letter from Santaflora to Verallo in which the latter was instructed to inform the Emperor of the proposed translation, while avoiding any appearance of soliciting his approval. The Legates were to use their discretion whether this open letter should be forwarded or not to its destination.² The Imperialist Cardinals and Mendoza received the communication with strong disapproval. Farnese, with the consent of the Legates, came to an understanding with them that neither should the translation be decided upon nor the letter to Verallo forwarded until they had once more received a reply from the Pope to the reports to be presented to him by Farnese and the Legates; in the meanwhile, the Council was to continue its labours in the congregations.³ The plan of bringing the question of translation before the next general congregation was abandoned by the Legates on the receipt of a written

¹ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 170 *seq.*, n. 2; see also PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 8, n. 4.

² Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 171, n.

³ Farnese to Paul III., dat. Trent, Aug. 9, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 179-182); the Legates to Santaflora, dat. Aug. 9, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, 181 *seq.*, n. 3). Cervini in a confidential letter to Maffei written at this time urged that the present opportunity should not be neglected and no postponement be permitted (*ibid.*, 182, n.).

expostulation from Farnese, who had left Trent on the 10th of August. On the contrary, del Monte, on the 13th of August, after an introductory address tending to allay the apprehensions of the Fathers for their safety in Trent, ordered the discussion of the decree on justification to be resumed.¹

A letter of Bishop de' Nobili of Accia is descriptive of the situation then existing. He speaks strongly of the great disinclination of the Legates and a large number of the Fathers to see the work of the Synod obstructed by the Emperor's insistence that the decree on justification should not take shape out of consideration for the Protestants. It is matter of complaint, writes de' Nobili, that the Council has been deprived of its freedom, many Fathers on that account have left, others make the best of the situation² In letters to Santaflora of the 16th and 17th of August the Legates complain that the Imperialists assiduously protract the work of the sittings, and beg to be removed from their posts.³

Paul III. displayed great indignation on hearing Cattaneo and Bertano's account of the attitude of Charles V. and of his threatening language towards Cervini. He also spoke very angrily of Madruzzo, accusing him of having incited the Emperor against the Legates.⁴ It was only with great reluctance that the Pope made up his mind to defer the translation of the Council for a while. Already on the 16th of August he had, through Santaflora, renewed the authority given to the Legates to take this step, provided it conformed to the voice of the majority. They were,

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 566 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 8, n. 5.

² See EHSSES in the *Rom. Quartalschr.*, XIX., 182.

³ *Cf.* *Nuntiatgeberichte*, IX., 183, n. ; MERKLE, I., 568, n. 2.

⁴ PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 10, n. 2.

however, if possible, without delaying the opportunity for removal, to proceed as far as they could with the decrees on justification and the residence of bishops and to have them settled in their entirety or in part.¹ On the following day, however, news reached Rome that in the event of a translation the Emperor intended to come to an understanding with the Protestants, or to take steps to constitute a national council. Upon this the Pope resolved, all convinced though he was of the necessity of a translation, to meet the Emperor so far as to detain the Council at Trent for some time longer and to settle the decrees under consideration. Farnese was to use his influence to obtain from Charles a declaration that he would consent to the translation taking place at the end of September or the middle of October. The Legates in the meantime were to secure the consent of the prelates so as to be certain of having a majority in favour of the translation at any time at which the Pope might announce a fresh decision respecting it. These instructions were communicated to Farnese and the Legates on the 17th of August.² On the 24th Santaflora wrote to Farnese³ that the Council must be moved at the latest by the end of October; the Emperor

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 191, n. 1. On Aug. 14, 1546, Vinc. Parenzi wrote from Rome to Lucca, that Lucca was one of the four cities in which eventually the Council would be held. The Government of Lucca wrote on Aug. 20 to Cardinal Guidiccioni requesting him to ask the Pope to omit their city from the number (State Archives, Lucca). The pros and cons for holding the Council in Ferrara were considered in a *letter from Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. Mantua, Aug. 17, 1546, Cod. Barb. Lat., 5793, f. 161 *seq.* (Vatican Library).

² Santaflora to Farnese, dat. Aug. 17, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 191-193); Santaflora to the Legates (*ibid.*, 193, n. 1); *cf.* PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c 10, n. 2.

³ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 202 *seq.*

must also be led to ponder the danger of a schism arising if the aged Pope were to die while the Council sat at Trent.¹

The Legates, taking into consideration the repugnance shown by the prelates to a much longer continuance in Trent, would gladly have taken their votes at once in the general congregation on the question of translation and then have awaited the subsequent orders of the Pope.² They would not have been displeased even if the order prohibiting the Fathers to leave the Council on their own initiative had been relaxed, so that the necessity of a translation to avoid dissolution from within might have been proved by facts. But the Pope, mindful of the negotiations with the Emperor then in the air, refused his assent to both suggestions.³ The negotiations led to nothing. Farnese attempted in vain in an audience on the 29th of August in the camp at Ingoldstadt to win the Emperor's approval of a translation to Lucca.⁴ Charles explained to the Legate that the presence of the Council in Trent was exactly the one thing essential to the assured success of his operations in the field, so that Farnese for the moment could only declare that he would advise the

¹ PALLAVICINI (l. 8, c. 12, n. 2) thinks that the principal reason, although not openly expressed in their correspondence with Rome, which led the Legates to wish for a translation of the Council was their anxiety lest the Pope should die suddenly. In that case the freedom of election would be endangered if the Council were being held in a place where the influence of the princes was so powerful.

² The Legates to Farnese, dat. Aug. 20, 1546 (Nuntiatürberichte, IX., 193, n. 3).

³ PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 10, n. 3.

⁴ Farnese to Paul III., dat. Ingolstadt, Aug. 30, 1546 (Nuntiatürberichte, IX., 210-212). That Lucca, in the letter to Santaflora of Aug. 28 (PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 8, n. 2), had already written to decline, could not yet have been known to Farnese (*cf.* Nuntiatürberichte, IX., 210, n. 5). Further discussion took place on Sept. 3 between Granvelle and Verallo in place of the sick Legate (*ibid.*, 222-224).

Pope to order the Synod to continue its sittings there for some weeks longer, under the assumption that it was now a certainty that after that the translation might be undertaken. To the conciliar Legates Farnese wrote on the 31st of August¹ that for the present they must not move in the matter. Cardinal Truchsess of Augsburg also warned them with reference to existing circumstances, in a letter of the 31st of August, what the consequences of a translation would be.² Farnese found the Emperor, in consequence of the tardy progress of the war, in a less uncompromising mood on September the 8th.³ The latter still declared that under the conditions of the moment all talk of a translation was out of the question, but he thought that perhaps later on the matter might admit of discussion when it had become apparent what the further course of the campaign would be.

The Pope was exceedingly mortified by the attitude of Charles V. In the beginning of September he remarked in a discussion with the ambassador Vega: "You have not yet been victorious over the Protestants, and nevertheless your demands are already insupportable; what will your first step be when the Emperor is victorious? . . ." ⁴ Paul III. was unshaken in his determination that the translation should take place, and on the 11th of September,⁵ in his reply to Farnese's first report, bade him repeatedly call attention to its necessity, adducing in particular, among other reasons, the danger of schism in the case of his

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 10, n. 4.

² *Ibid.*

³ Cf. Verello to Santaflora, dat. Sept. 11, 1546, and Farnese to Santaflora, dat. Sept. 11, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 236 *seq.*).

⁴ CAMPANA, 503.

⁵ Santaflora to Farnese, dat. Sept. 11, 1546 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 246).

death.¹ On the 15th of September the Pope ordered a letter to be sent to the Legates² making urgent inquiries as to the prospects of a majority when the question came up for decision by the votes of the Council. On the 20th of September, Paul III., after an interview with the Imperial ambassador to discuss the Emperor's objection to the translation, directed Santaflora to write³ that he still held by his opinion that the removal ought to take place by the middle of October; this Farnese was at liberty to communicate to the Emperor, who would appreciate the Pope's reasons, with which he was already previously acquainted. The conciliar Legates were again, in a letter from Santaflora of the 22nd of September,⁴ requested to state what result they anticipated on submitting the question to the vote in the middle of October. In the meantime they were to push on as far as possible the decree on justification as well as that on episcopal residence, so that it might not appear as if the Council were going to rise from its labours in order to evade reform.

Further difficulties at this time were raised, to the Pope's annoyance, by Francis I.,⁵ who refused to consent to the choice of an Imperial city, but on the contrary wished the Council to be transferred to Avignon whither, he promised, he could induce even the English and Lutherans to come.

¹ Cf. also Maffei's letter to Farnese, dat. Oct. 14, 1546 (Nuntiaturlberichte, IX., 288, n. 1).

² Santaflora to the Legates, dat. Sept. 15, 1546 (extract, *ibid.*, 246, n. 2).

³ Cf. *ibid.*, 264, n. 1.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.* The letter was brought to Trent on Sept. 26 by Vega's secretary, Marquina, who, at the ambassador's bidding, was on his way to the Imperial court.

⁵ Maffei to Cervini, dat. Sept. 19, 1546 (cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 10, n. 6); Maffei to Farnese, dat. Oct. 6, 1546 (Nuntiaturlberichte, IX., 271).

On the 2nd of October Maffei wrote to Farnese¹ that in his opinion the Pope, in case of necessity, would decide on a further postponement of the translation in order to avoid the convocation of a national council by the Emperor or something even worse than that; Farnese, however, was to do all he could to overcome the opposition of the monarch; the latter might hand over the management of religious matters to the Pope, just as the Pope had left the management of the war to his Majesty. As the month of October was half over without any fresh news coming from Farnese concerning the matter, the Pope had conveyed to him the expression of his astonishment and the reiterated intimation that the time was now fully come to proceed on the grounds already mentioned.²

The Legates on their part were now no longer willing to take upon themselves the responsibility of deciding on the question of translation through the votes of the Council.³ On the contrary, they proposed on the 9th of October⁴ that the Pope should suspend the Council after the close of the approaching sitting and then summon the prelates to Rome in order to establish the remaining reforms with their approval and consent. A principal reason for this proposal was the repeated opposition, on the part of the Imperialist prelates, to the further consideration of the dogmatic decrees which the Legates had to encounter at this time. Paul III.'s treatment of this proposal was vacillating.

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 272.

² Santaflora to Farnese, dat. Oct. 14, 1546 (*ibid.*, 287 *seq.*). On Oct. 14, 18, and 20 Verallo reported to Santaflora on his and Farnese's further negotiations with Granvelle, which left the question on the old footing (*ibid.*, 293, 296 *seqq.*, 302 *seq.*).

³ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 15, n. 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, n. 10. In further confirmation of this opinion, which emanated from Cervini himself, the latter wrote on Oct. 9 a special letter to the Pope (*ibid.*).

On October the 14th Maffei wrote to Farnese¹ that his Holiness seemed disinclined to it. On the other hand, he wrote again on the 16th,² Paul III. for a time was against any alterations with regard to the Council, but that he approved of a suspension if it could be arranged without opposition and with the consent of the Imperialists. A letter of Maffei to Cervini of October the 16th³ also expressed fears lest the matter should be carried out contrary to the decision of a majority in the Council.

On the 20th of October Maffei informed Farnese⁴ that the Pope now intended, so as to avoid any cause of offence to the Emperor, to give no order himself for a translation or suspension of the Council but to leave the matter to the Council's own decision, as a measure whereby the continued attendance of the Imperialist prelates at the Synod would be secured; then he intended to convene prelates of different countries in Rome for the purpose of drawing up a draft of reform. In the same sense Santafiora wrote to the Legates on the 20th of October.⁵ Three days later he gave them to understand⁶ that they had better take steps towards suspension as quickly as possible, before the aspect of affairs underwent a change.

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 288, n. 1.

² *Ibid.*

³ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 15, n. 11; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., xxxvi *seq.*

⁴ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 300 *seq.*

⁵ Since the suspension "a beneplacito di Sua Santità," as at first desired by the Pope, he adds, although certainly approved by the majority, was yet sure to meet with considerable opposition, while a suspension for a fixed period, not less however than six months, would be agreed to unanimously, the Legates ought to have full discretion as to the steps to be taken (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 300 *seq.*, n. 5).

⁶ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 309, n. 1; cf. *ibid.*, xxxvii.

The Legates in their reply of the 25th of October,¹ besides pointing out that the favourable opportunity which had offered at the beginning of the month was over, urged in particular how dangerous it would be if the powers of self-suspension were to be recognized in the Council when, like those of summons and dissolution, they resided in the Pope alone; such a measure, moreover, could only be passed in a session, and for this they were not sufficiently prepared. They designed, however, to consider carefully several ways by which the Pope's intentions might be carried out. First of all they must play upon the Imperialists' fears of a translation in order to obtain their consent to a suspension as the lesser of two evils. Madruzzo undertook to apply this argument to Pacheco and Mendoza. Mendoza seemed even to be in agreement,² and held out prospects of the Emperor's consent.

The last accounts received, on the 28th of October, from Farnese before his return from Germany, through his secretary Antonio Elio,³ who had been sent on in advance, were not favourable to suspension.⁴ According to these the Emperor in opposing the project adhered to the reasons he had already expressed, although he did not intend thereby to dispute in any way the right of the Pope to adopt such a measure even without his consent. For the rest he no longer intended to oppose the wishes of Paul III. in respect of the future action of the Council whether in matters of dogma or of reform. Charles V.

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 15, n. 11; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 309, n. 1; cf. *ibid.*, xxxviii.

² Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 15, n. 12; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 347, n. 1.

³ Massarelli, Diarium, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 582.

⁴ Farnese's instructions for Elio on making his report in the Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 609 *seqq.*

set forth his standpoint with greater precision in his instructions to Don Juan Hurtado de Mendoza,¹ who at the end of October had been sent as ambassador-extraordinary to Rome. Charles herein declared that it had never been his intention to hinder the proceedings of the Council in the deliberations on the article on justification; what was of interest to him was that this subject should be examined and tested with the greatest thoroughness on account of its importance in relation to the Protestants. He therefore thought it also appropriate that fresh invitations from the Pope and the Legates should be sent to the German bishops requesting their attendance at the Council or at least, so far as they had legitimate excuses to offer, that of their theologians, especially those who had taken part in the religious conferences of time past and knew all the ins and outs of their opponents' machinations. He also thought that it might be well to submit the article on justification to the opinion of some of the universities, such as Paris or Louvain.

Besides the affairs of the Council, Mendoza was to treat of delay in the payment of the subsidies promised by Paul III. for the war against the Protestant Estates and the appointment of Verallo with plenipotentiary powers to execute the functions of Legate to the army, hitherto vested in Farnese. The Cardinal, who suffered severely from the unaccustomed climate of Germany, had already applied for recall, but out of consideration for the Emperor his request had been refused. Now at last, on the approach of

¹ Oct. 18, 1540 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 612 *seqq.*; *cf. ibid.*, xxxiv *seq.*). The conciliar Legates, as they wrote to Santafiora on Nov. 10, had been informed by Diego de Mendoza of the mission of Juan de Mendoza and the nature of his commission concerning the Council (*cf. PALLAVICINI*, l. 8, c. 15, n. 13; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 348, n. 2; MERKLE, I., 584, n. 1).

the cold season, permission was granted to him, and on the 25th of October 1546 he began his return journey to Italy. Two days previously he had his farewell audience. In this all the questions still at issue, especially the Council and the agreement with Francis I., came under discussion, and finally an opportunity was given to treat of an incident which affected the conflict of interests on both sides in the Italian Peninsula. This was the dispute between Pier Luigi Farnese and the Count del Verme of Romagnese, whom the viceroy of Milan, Ferrante Gonzaga, protected.¹

The supremacy of Spain bore heavily on Italy. For this reason Paul III. from the beginning of his pontificate felt that both as Pope and as an Italian ruler he was bound to oppose the establishment in Milan of the authority of a sovereign who was already master of Naples and Sicily. Naples and Milan under one ruler threatened not merely the remains of Italian autonomy but the independence of the Holy See. Paul III. would have liked best to have seen Milan in the hands of a Farnese, or at any rate of an Italian, but if this presented itself as an impossibility, then a French would have been more desirable than an Imperial prince, as in the former case at least an equilibrium of forces would have been restored in Italy. The peace of Crespy stipulated that either the Netherlands or Milan should be held by the Duke of Orleans, son of Francis I. After the Duke's death (September the 8th, 1545) had made this engagement void it was not to be expected that Francis would rest quiet without some compensation for his baffled prospects. The King, in fact, did hold Savoy for himself for a while, but in this question "the interests of France lay hidden by those of the Pope, to whom the establishment of Imperial

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 310, n. 1; *cf.* Venet. Depeschen, II., 57, 60, 62-66.

preponderance in Italy could not be less insupportable than it was to the King.”¹

The conflict of interests in Italy had become more acute when Charles V. in April 1546 appointed Ferrante Gonzaga as viceroy of Milan. Paul III. had hoped that Ottavio Farnese, the Emperor's son-in-law, would have received this important post. Instead of the latter there came to Milan in the person of Gonzaga a man who was a bitter adversary of the house of Farnese and one who at a former time had cast covetous eyes on Parma and Piacenza.² Ferrante's brother, Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, did all he could to keep this enmity alive ;³ no wonder the conflict with Pier Luigi, whose recognition as Duke of Parma and Piacenza the Emperor stubbornly declined, was an endless one. In this contention the Imperial diplomacy interfered in favour of Gonzaga.⁴

As Pier Luigi, to counteract the hostility of the Imperialists, attached himself to France, the situation grew even more strained. Ferrante urged Charles V. to put an end to the matter by expelling Pier Luigi from Parma and Piacenza. What under such circumstances would follow when Charles made himself completely master in Germany? The old dread felt by Paul III. grew more intense, kept alive as it was by the machinations of France. The Imperial supremacy was bound to react with the worst effects on the Farnese family, on the States of the Church, and on the Council.

While the conflict between Papal and Imperial interests

¹ FRIEDENSBURG'S opinion in *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., xlii.

² See GOSELLINI, *Vita de. F. Gonzaga*, 14, 18 ; MAURENBRECHER, 115 *seq.*

³ *Cf.* in Appendix No. 32 the *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga of Oct. 13, 1546 (Vatican Library).

⁴ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., xlv, 316, 317.

was reaching its sharpest point the position of the nuncio Verallo at the court of Charles was one of poignant distress. On the 12th of November 1546 the nuncio and Granvelle came into violent collision during an examination of their respective grievances. Granvelle complained of the lack of support given to his master by the Pope; he once more turned the discussion in an uncalled-for manner on the disclosure of the treaty of June to the Swiss. Verallo's attempts at an excuse were brushed aside by the Imperial minister, who demanded angrily that the Pope should show more zeal in his behaviour. On Verallo asking what then his Holiness was to do, Granvelle referred him to the mission of Mendoza. The nuncio replied that Paul III. would certainly do all that was possible, but reciprocity demanded that the Emperor on his side should make some advances to the Pope. "What advances? What advances?" cried Granvelle. "We would like to send him a whole army who should fire him a salvo and blow an alarm." In consequence of this scornful rebuff Verallo on his part also broke through his restraint and enumerated a series of points in which Charles V. had failed to show any compliance: the still unsettled incident of the prebend of Barletta, the encroachments on ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Naples and Spain, and other instances. Granvelle replied that general affairs and private ought not to be mixed, and said threateningly that if the Pope did not give more thorough and more substantial support it would be necessary to find out other ways of safeguarding the Imperial interests. When the nuncio then brought forward Pier Luigi's quarrel with the Count del Verme the two diplomatists fell into a renewed altercation. In the eagerness of their dispute they both sprang from their seats, a circumstance which Granvelle made use of to close the interview and bow the nuncio politely out. In

the report which Verallo at once sent to Rome of this occurrence he drew the conclusion that Charles V. was bent on making his supremacy effective over the whole of Italy.¹

The impression made in Rome by these and other communications need not be described. It was the extreme of unwisdom on the Emperor's part to exasperate and wound the Pope's feelings at the very moment when he was asking for a prolongation of the treaty. Cardinal Farnese, who was once more in Rome on the 10th of December, found the Pope still undecided but deeply hurt that even in such a small matter as that of the "spolia" of the bishopric of Badajoz the Emperor showed not the smallest desire to oblige him. Nor did the Pope feel less painfully Granvelle's behaviour over the quarrel between Pier Luigi and the Count del Verme. Verallo was instructed on the 13th of December to bring both matters once more before the Emperor. In this letter Farnese impressed on the nuncio the necessity of establishing a secure peace between Charles V. and Francis I. as that upon which everything else depended.²

For such a peace the Pope had been working ever since November with an earnestness³ proportioned to the clearness with which he gauged the consequences of a breach between the two monarchs. In this case he was in conflict with France, as his alliance with the Emperor was still binding. It was therefore of great importance to him to induce the Emperor to withdraw from Piedmont as a concession to Francis I. By taking the part of the French King in this matter he put the latter under an obligation, a circumstance of double value while his relations with the

¹ See Verallo's letter of Nov. 12, 1546, *ibid.*, IX., 339 *seqq.*

² See Farnese's letter of Dec. 13, 1546, *ibid.*, 387 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, IX., xliii.

Emperor were so strained. As an intermediary in the cause of peace the Modenese, Gurone Bertano, was on the 5th of January 1547 sent to Germany.¹

In the meantime the question had become urgent whether the alliance concluded with the Emperor should be prolonged or not. It appears that Cardinal Farnese was in favour of a further guarantee of help, while the Pope from the first had leaned to a contrary opinion.² He was principally influenced by his old fear of the Emperor's supremacy, but also by the little inclination displayed by the latter for a peace with France.³ Therefore, since the outbreak of another Franco-Imperial war seemed probable, Paul III. was confronted with the danger of being drawn into the strife with results in the sphere of politics and of ecclesiastical affairs which no man could foresee.

At the time of Farnese's mission to Germany Paul III., fully realizing this danger, had instructed him to bring his influence to bear on Charles V. in favour of a final peace with Francis. He had been untiring in pointing out to the Imperialist as well as to the French representatives in Rome the necessity of such a peace, had ordered the nuncio to work in the same sense,⁴ and finally, when all else had proved vain, had sent Bertano. Until this question was settled Paul III. could not make up his mind to prolong his alliance with the Emperor. There was the further consideration that after the news of the war in Germany, received in December, a turn in affairs had

¹ See PIEPER, Nuntiaturen, 130, 189 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 412 *seq.*

² Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 413, n. 1.

³ For the Emperor's motives, see Nuntiaturberichte, XI., xlii-xliii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, xliii-xliv, 335, n. 1.

taken place which apparently made the Emperor much more independent than hitherto of assistance.¹ The state of the Papal finances also threw weight into the scale. The despatch and upkeep of the Pope's contingent had cost 300,000 ducats.² How was it possible for the Pope, who had to bear also the burden of the not inconsiderable expenses of the Council, to produce the immense sums demanded by a fresh war? Finally, and this may well have been the master motive, the Pope was full of distrust of the intentions of Charles, who had addressed to Verallo the language of menace.³ What had been gained by the great sacrifices already made? The answer did not admit of doubt. Simply that the political power of the Emperor had been greatly strengthened, while in matters of religion, even after his successes in south Germany, a state of uncertainty prevailed.

Apart from Cologne, where the removal of Hermann von Wied was rendered possible,⁴ the Catholic cause at first derived very little advantage from the swing of the pendulum. The restoration⁵ of a few convents in Wurt-

¹ Together with *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., xliv, 387, *cf.* also the *report of the Sieneſe envoy, A. Sansedoni, dat Rome, Dec. 8 and 17, 1546 (State Archives, Siena). See also H. Tiranno's *report to the Duchess of Urbino of Dec. 11, 1546 (State Archives, Florence).

² See *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., xxii.

³ See in Appendix No. 33 the *report of H. Tiranno of Dec. 11, 1546 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ Hermann von Wied, already deposed by the Pope on April 16, 1546, had to resign on Jan. 26, 1547, the administratorship of Paderborn, and on Feb. 25 the Archbishopric of Cologne (see VARRENTAPP, 272 *seq.*; BUCH WEINSBERG, published by Höhlbaum, I., Leipzig, 1886, 260; GULIK, Gropper, 117-120).

⁵ The Imperialists pointed to this and Pflug's establishment in Naumburg as well as to the removal of Hermann von Wied from Cologne (*Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 456, n. 1).

emberg meant very little in presence of the fact that the Imperial policy was much more bent on bringing the defeated Protestants into civil subjection to the head of the Empire than into religious obedience to the Pope. On many grounds these tedious, cautious methods, which in their results indeed were not successful, seemed to be justified; but in any case it was the Emperor's duty to have fulfilled his treaty obligations in matters of religion. By them he was expressly bound not to make any agreement with the Protestants on matters affecting the cause or object of the war without the consent of the Pope or his Legate, and especially to refuse concessions which would run counter to the interests of religion and the constitution of the Catholic Church.¹

The Imperial diplomatists had already infringed this stipulation by the engagements entered into at Ratisbon with Duke Maurice of Saxony and the Margrave Hans of Brandenburg-Cüstrin. While in the treaty with the Pope the origin of the war as alleged was the refusal to submit to the Council sitting at Trent, in the agreement with the Duke and the Margrave the authority of the Council was altogether disregarded.² In those made with the Count Palatine Frederick and Duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg the question of religion was not even mentioned.³ Also in the treaties with the Estates of the Oberland the recognition of the Council was not made a condition, but only submission to the decrees of the Diet and the jurisdiction of the Imperial Chancery. In religious affairs the Emperor still

¹ *Cf. supra*, p. 289.

² *Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR*, III., 18th ed., 622 *seq.*, 671.

³ *Cf. PALLAVICINI*, I. 9, c. 3; STÄLIN, *Wirtemb. Geschichte*, IV., 460. With the ratification of the treaty of Cadan the continuance of Protestantism was secured (see RANKE, *Deutsche Geschichte*, IV., 6th ed., 339).

gave these Estates express security for the toleration of the "existing religion," on account of which they were not to be liable "to the sword or any other form of forcible authority."¹ Accordingly the Protestant preachers were at liberty, even under the very eyes of the Emperor, to go about as before declaiming against "the Antichrist in Rome."²

All these treaties with the defeated Protestant Estates were concluded without the consent of the Pope or that of the Legate's successor, the nuncio Verallo, having been invited, as was expressly laid down in the compact of June 1546.³ That Charles was well aware of the violation of treaty thus committed is clear from his anxious endeavours to keep Verallo aloof from all negotiations. The nuncio only appeared upon the scene in order to hear the Emperor's complaints of the behaviour of the Papal troops and his threats against Paul III. if the latter should not consent to a prolongation of the treaty. It was a misfortune that here again Verallo was not equal to his task; a stronger man would have insisted more forcibly on the observance of the treaty.

If the whole of the previous behaviour of the Emperor had been of a kind to disgust Paul III. in the highest degree with the treaty, so must the disloyal agreement with the Protestant Estates, in the hour of their defeat, have revived the opinion in Rome that the Emperor was only making use of the Pope's assistance for the extension of

¹ Cf. RANKE, IV., 6th ed., 336 *seq.*; KEIM, Reformation in Ulm, Stuttgart, 1851, 375 *seq.*; EGELHAAF, II., 476; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 444, n. 2.

² Cf. Venet. Depeschen, II., 137.

³ Cf. Maffei's complaints in the letter of Jan. 23, 1547, in BALAN, VI., 282, as well as Farnese's letter of Feb. 5, 1547, in the Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 456.

his own political power and that, heedless of the Papal interests, he was making a vital attack on the Church by illicit concessions to his adversaries in order to disarm their opposition. Under these circumstances, the Pope's determination to refuse the renewal of the treaty, which had expired in December, to suspend his subsidies and to withdraw his forces, is intelligible.

Intelligible as this course of action by Paul III. might have been under existing circumstances, undisputed as his formal rights were, yet the question may be asked whether a Pope led only by ecclesiastical considerations would have taken a step which was of a kind to give the Protestants the greatest advantage.¹ The quarrel between the Emperor and the Pope, moreover, never would have been of so violent a character if France had not continually fanned the flame. Paul III., in his dread of the Hapsburgs becoming masters of the world, was only too ready to listen to such insinuations, especially when Charles V. gave cause for just complaint. Both parties were to blame for the outbreak of fresh causes of dissension and the final dissolution of an alliance directed against the common enemy.²

The withdrawal of a benefaction is not seldom construed as an active offence. Paul III. was too well schooled in human nature not to know this; therefore the briefs drawn up on the 22nd of January 1547, announcing the recall of the Papal auxiliary forces, were couched in the most temperate language. Charles was congratulated in the handsomest terms on a victory in which indeed the Pope himself also had been a participator, and the expectation was expressed that his work in Germany would be

¹ RANKE (Päpste, I., 6th ed., 167) goes too far in saying that the Pope felt that he was then an ally of the Protestants.

² HERGENRÖTHER (Kirche und Staat, 220) thinks that not the smallest share of the blame lies on Charles V.

crowned by a restoration of the Catholic religion. With genuine diplomatic skill the most important point was introduced briefly at the close: "Since the war is as good as at an end, and your Majesty's position is wholly favourable and secure, we have determined to recall from Germany the troops sent to your aid and which now are terribly reduced in numbers, with the intention, in the case of such another occasion arising and your undertaking a similar war against the enemies of the Christian religion, of again springing to your side, as we have hitherto done, according to our own strength and that of the Apostolic See."¹

To Cardinal Farnese, who still favoured an extension of the alliance, fell the disagreeable task of giving Verallo more precise instructions as to the manner in which he was to justify the contents of the brief on its delivery to the Emperor. The nuncio was to call attention to the Pope's deep regret that audience was so long refused to his representative and that the latter, contrary to treaty, had not been admitted to the negotiations with the Protestant Estates. In a drastic postscript written in his own hand Farnese gave lively expression to his keen annoyance at the turn affairs had taken. During his presence at the Imperial court a deaf ear had been turned to his expostulations that greater consideration should be shown to the Pope. Like Cassandra, he had foreseen everything that had come to pass.²

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 98; *cf.* also Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 422, n. 1.

² Farnese's letter to Verallo, dat. Jan. 22, 1547 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 421 *seq.*). Concerning the refusal of an audience, FRIEDENSBURG says (*ibid.*, xlvi), correctly, that this complaint was unfounded. But that there had not been also a previous infringement of the treaty, I cannot agree to. That such had taken place is assumed by DE LEVA (IV., 184) and RANKE (Deutsch. Gesch., IV., 6th ed., 300).

Farnese's prognostications of evil were surpassed by the reception given to Verallo in an audience at Ulm, on the 2nd of February 1547, when he presented his instructions to the Emperor, then exasperated by the publication of the decree on justification at Trent and by the exhortations of Bertano to come to a peace with France.

As far as the recall of the Papal troops was concerned, Charles observed scornfully, he was thankful to be quit of a pack of Italian robbers who had done nothing but harm ; only, the reasons adduced for the withdrawal were puerile and untrue. For the congratulations offered by his Holiness he kissed his feet, but did not believe in their sincerity ; on the contrary, he had become more and more convinced that the Pope had entangled him in this war with the intention of destroying him. In order to give a hint that he saw through the cause of such conduct the Emperor, whose temper had been steadily rising, recalled a well-known Italian proverb to the effect that it was excusable in young men to contract the French sickness but not in the old. Although the nuncio tried to give another turn to the discussion, the Emperor applied the proverb, so insulting in its double meaning to the Pope, a little further by remarking that this was no new complaint with Paul III., as he had already suffered from it in his youth. Throwing off figures of speech, the Emperor said plainly that the Pope was getting out of his alliance on the inducement of France. He was certain that Paul III.'s one object in drawing him into war was to ruin him ; but God had ordained otherwise, and he hoped, even without the Pope's help, to bring his undertaking to a victorious end. Charles accounted for his refusal to give an audience by his many preoccupations, his gout, and the conviction that Verallo only wished to ply him with empty speeches.

To the complaint that he had made agreements with the Protestant Estates without consulting the Pope, Charles replied in anger that he had acted with wise precaution, since the name of Paul III. was so hated in Germany and many other Christian countries on account of his evil deeds that its introduction would only have wrought harm. The Emperor then returned once more to his standing grievance of the disclosure of the treaty to the Swiss, whereby Paul III. sought intentionally to embroil him with the Protestants. He was conscious of having performed his own duty as a Christian prince better than the Pope had done his, and he hoped that the day would yet come when he should be able to tell the Pontiff so to his face. He cherished the certain expectation of bringing the war, from which Paul III. retired, to such a finish that he might perhaps prove a cause of inconvenience to a third party. A rejoinder from the nuncio he cut short by leaving the room upon the pretext that it was time for him to go to Mass. The Emperor had spoken so loud in his passion that those waiting in the antechamber understood his expressions of wrath at the Pope for being on so good a footing with the French.¹

Even Granvelle, who in other respects was sorry for the violent behaviour towards Verallo, imputed Paul III.'s conduct chiefly to French influence.² The nuncio therefore tried in a second audience which he had together with Bertano to defend his master against all these accusations, by adducing the reasons which had been conclusive against a renewal of the treaty. While this parleying on these and other debatable points was going on, Verallo perceived in

¹ For Verallo's audience we have, as well as his report (*Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 444 *seq.*), that of Charles V. to Mendoza (*MAUREN-BRECHER*, 90* *seq.*); *cf.* also *Venet. Depeschen*, II., 163.

² See *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 448.

the Emperor a more approachable frame of mind. Nevertheless, Charles could not refrain from saying that if France began to make war upon him and the Pope left him in the lurch he would come to terms with the Protestants. In the same audience Charles declared openly that the revolt of Genoa under Fiesco against the Imperialist Doria, hatched with the help of France, had taken place in understanding with the Pope. This Verallo emphatically challenged. At the close of the audience Charles stated that in future his bearing towards the Pope would depend upon the behaviour of the latter towards him.¹

The outburst of anger, in which the Emperor had attacked the Pope personally and asserted, in direct contradiction to facts, that the latter had enticed him into war,² was not by any means a momentary fit of passion but had a calculated purpose. The threats, mingled with violent complaints, were intended to intimidate his former ally and force him to further compliance, especially in relation to finance.

The claims of Charles in this respect, now of long standing, led to nothing less than a vast scheme of secularization. All the churches and convents throughout his empire and states were to surrender a half of the movable property in gold and silver and a half of their yearly income from the funds for the support of edifices. Even in Madrid such a requisition was regarded with dismay.³

¹ For this audience also we have the reports of Verallo (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 462 *seq.*) and of Charles V. (MAURENBRECHER, 94* *seq.*; *cf.* MAYNIER, 455 *seq.*).

² That the Emperor himself determined on the Schmalkaldic war is incontrovertible (see *supra*, p. 223 *seqq.*); see also FRIEDENSBURG in Nuntiaturberichte, X., xxix; *cf.* RIEZLER, 339.

³ See MAURENBRECHER, 47* *seqq.*, 123; *cf.* Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 624.

The proposal, moreover, was made in a way most likely to offend Paul III. The haughty behaviour of the Imperialists in Rome betrayed clearly their intention of treating the Pope with insolence.¹ Paul III., however, did not lose his presence of mind;² he replied firmly that so immoderate a demand, the result of which was beyond conjecture, could not be acceded to; a specified amount somewhat over 400,000 ducats would admit of discussion. The Imperialists, however, would hear nothing of this, taunted the Pope with his partiality towards France, and declared plainly that in case of necessity they would proceed without the Pope's permission with their plan of secularization, which had received the sanction of their theologians. In audience on the 27th of February 1547 they even went so far as to threaten the Pope's person. Paul III., however, was no Clement VII. With much dignity he told them that an old man, whose days in any case could not be long extended, was not one to be frightened by such threats as these, and if he had to die a martyr for the honour of God, this for him would only be glorious—death indeed would bring him freedom from the care and toil which accompanied his position in such an age and among such princes.³

That Charles V. was determined to go to extremes Paul III. must have understood from the unprecedented language which he had indulged in to the nuncio Verallo. The French policy in the meantime aimed unremittingly at widening the breach between the Pope and Emperor and producing an incurable antagonism. Cardinal du Bellay drew the nuncio Dandino's attention to the Emperor's toleration of the Protestant confessions in the Estates

¹ Thus FRIEDENSBURG in *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., li.

² Cf. Ruggieri's report of Feb. 16, 1547, in *BALAN*, VI., 382.

³ See the contemporary reports in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 494, n. 4; cf. *ibid.*, li.

which had made their submission, and asked the question if that were not a betrayal of the Holy See.¹

The Emperor's behaviour was, in fact, favourable to such insinuations. Although southern Germany was tranquilized, the state of religion remained just as it was; indeed it seemed as if the Emperor had abandoned the war against the leaders of the Schmalkaldic League, now retired into northern Germany, and was once more directing his attention to Italy. While the Count Egmont of Büren was ordered to discharge a portion of the troops, new Spanish levies were recruited for purposes upon which Ferrante Gonzaga was called in to deliberate. He was of opinion that they should be sent to Siena in order to hold in check² the Pope and the Farnesi, who for a long time had had their eyes fixed on that city. Together with this went Ferrante's design, which was becoming more and more pronounced, of wresting Parma and Piacenza from the Papal family.³

In view of this situation it was not surprising⁴ if Paul III., sorely menaced in the political as well as the ecclesiastical sphere by the domination of the victorious Hapsburg, should have seen not in the Protestants but in the Emperor the more dangerous enemy of the two, and would have been not altogether displeased if the Schmalkaldic forces in northern Germany had held their own against the Imperial army.⁵

¹ See DRUFFEL, Sfondrato, 310.

² *Ibid.*, 310, 311.

³ See *infra*, p. 369 *seqq.*

⁴ Thus DRUFFEL (Sfondrato, 311).

⁵ In an *undated* letter of Du Mortier to the French King it says : S. S. a eu nouvelles de la defaite du marquis de Brandenburg par l'industrie de la sœur du Landgrave et entendu que le duc de Saxe se trouve fort, dont elle a tel contentement comme celui qui estime le commun ennemy estre par ces moyens retenu d'exécuter ses entreprises et connoist-on bien qu'il serait utile sous main entretenir ceux

The danger appeared all the greater to Paul III. since he could not count with certainty either on France or Venice. Under these circumstances he hit upon a strange plan whereby he hoped to evade giving his consent to the Emperor's ever more urgent demands for the great scheme of secularization: special Cardinal-Legates, Sfondrato and Capodiferro, were to invite Charles V. and Francis I. to avail themselves of the opportunity offered by the death of Henry VIII. (27th-28th January 1547) to undertake the recovery of England to the Catholic Church.¹

When Verallo on the 11th of March 1547 communicated this project to the Emperor in Nördlingen, the latter grasped the opportunity of once more giving expression to his anger at the Pope's conduct. To please the Pope, who had treated him so shabbily in the present war, he cried out, he would not go to war against the commonest rapscallion, let alone the nation of England. As for the plan of secularization, he only refrained from carrying it into execution because he estimated the result at a low figure. Yet even Ferdinand the Catholic, who was much more of a Catholic than Paul III., had carried out such a scheme. For the future he would reserve his reverence only for St. Peter, but not for the Pontiff Paul. The war against the Protestants, which was in nowise yet settled, would be renewed immediately, and he hoped, even were it unpleasant for the Pope, to bring it to a good end. Since Paul III. refused him any other support, let them put the nuncio and the Legates in the forefront of the battle, so as

qui luy resistant, disant que vous ne scauriez faire de pense plus utile (RIBIER, I., 637). This letter is so evidently written with a direct purpose that it can hardly be relied upon without some further proof of credibility.

¹ Cf. MAYNIER, 456; DRUFFEL, *loc. cit.*, 312 *seqq.*; PIEPER, 130 *seq.*; FRIEDENSBURG in Nuntiaturberichte, IX., lii, 493, 494; X., xxiii.

to set a good example to the rest, and let men see what they can do with their exorcisms and blessings.¹

When things had gone thus far on the same 11th of March on which Verallo had had to submit to such outpourings of scorn and jeers on himself and the Pope, an event occurred by which the opposition between Pope and Emperor was sharply accentuated. This was the translation of the Council from Trent to Bologna. This most important measure came unexpectedly, as the Synod during the winter of 1546-7 had displayed much productive activity.

¹ For Verallo's audience at Nördlingen, see besides his letter of March 11, 1547 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 511), the communications of Charles V. to Mendoza in MAURENBRECHER, 102* *seqq.*, and MAYNIER, 457 *seq.*; *cf.* also Venet. Depeschen, II., 191, n. 2, 195 *seq.*, 203.

CHAPTER IX.

PROGRESS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.—ITS REMOVAL TO BOLOGNA.—THE SCHMALKALDIC WAR ENDS IN VICTORY FOR THE EMPEROR.—ASSASSINATION OF PIER LUIGI FARNESE.

WHEN Cardinal Farnese returned to Trent from his German legation on the 14th of November 1546, he there set to work to bring about an agreement between the opposed Papal and Imperialist interests in the Council. He succeeded, in fact, not merely in winning Cardinal Madruzzo but also Mendoza, the ambassador of Charles V., to agree to a suspension.¹ By this *via media* the translation might be avoided. After long and repeated conversations an agreement was reached on the following points: first, the postponement of the decree on justification; secondly, as it would not be fitting that a reform decree should be published by the Council without a dogmatic decree, but, on the other hand also, the reproach must be avoided that the Council wished to do nothing, the Pope must be asked to issue a Bull on the question of reform, to be afterwards read aloud and approved at the Council; thirdly, that the Council, on account of the Emperor's objection to a translation and of the danger of a suspension for an indefinite period, should be suspended at first for six months only. To this agreement the consent of the Pope and of the Emperor was to be invited. On the assump-

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 385 *seq.* See also PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 16, and *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 346 *seq.*

tion that the Emperor's consent was certain Farnese requested the Pope, in communicating the terms of the arrangement, to declare his consent also, and to intimate the same to the Legates.¹

The Legates in their report to Santaflora of the 17th of November² remarked that since Mendoza had anticipated the Emperor's consent they also had done so in the case of the Pope without saying anything of the powers committed to them to accept this measure. They intended in the meantime to work energetically for the formulation of the decree on justification, and advised that the Pope should, if the Emperor did not consent to a suspension, make known his will concerning the immediate publication of the decree, so that the Council might proceed on its course and soon be ended. The Legates expressed stronger doubts of the possibility of carrying through a suspension in their next letter to Santaflora of the 19th of November.³ Here they insisted that the favourable opportunity had already gone by, and doubted that the Emperor would confirm the agreement come to with his ambassador; in any case, they asked for the speedy transmission of regulations for the continuance of the work of the Council.

The Pope would have preferred, wrote Santaflora on the 23rd of November to Farnese,⁴ on receipt of his report from Trent, and to the Legates on the 29th of November,⁵ that the suspension had taken place at once after the arrangement had been come to with Mendoza without

¹ Letters of Nov. 16 and 17, 1546, *ibid.*, 346 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, *loc. cit.*

² Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 351-353.

³ *Ibid.*, IX., 353-355.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 361 *seq.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 362, n. 1.

waiting any longer for a message from the Emperor. If this should come in the sense hoped for, then the Pope, according to the letter of the 29th, would like the suspension to take place, not as proceeding from him; he would much rather in this case send the Legates a brief commanding them to procure the suspension by means of the vote of a majority. This promised brief was sent by Farnese to the Legates on the 13th of December.¹

The Emperor's answer was long delayed, and when it came contained a refusal. After Mendoza and Toledo in the meantime had left Trent, there appeared on the morning of the 20th, as representatives of the Imperial interests, Cardinals Madruzzo and Pacheco, with the Emperor's decision, which they made known to the Legates.² According to this Charles V. desired, out of consideration for German affairs, the postponement of the publication of the decree on justification and a further examination of the same. With regard to the duty of episcopal residence, he was in favour of the mode agreed to, namely, that the Pope should issue a Bull on the subject, but begged that the special interests of the Spanish bishops should be considered. The suspension of the Council he rejected entirely on the ground that now, after the success of his campaign, he hoped that Germany would submit to the decisions of the Council; but of that there could be no talk unless the Council remained in session, as otherwise its reputation was gone. Thereupon the Legates at once informed the Emperor's representatives that if under these circumstances the suspension was to be dropped, there was then no necessity to comply with the Emperor on the

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 390.

² Cf. the report of the Legates to Farnese of Dec. 20, 1546, *ibid.*, 398-403; *ibid.*, 401 *seq.*, n., a letter of Cervini's to Maffei of Dec. 20. Cf. also PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 16, n. 11, 12.

other points. If the Council was to remain in session the decree on justification must be published, and afterwards the remainder of the work quickly settled. They would therefore now, without delay, propose to the Fathers the discussion of the question of episcopal residence and the fixture of a terminal date for the sitting. This they did notwithstanding the objections of the two Cardinals in the general congregation¹ held on the afternoon of the same day; the voting was to take place on the following day. This was on December the 29th.² In accordance with the Legates' proposal the sitting was fixed for the 13th of January by a majority of more than two-thirds as against the sixteen votes of the Imperialists, led by Pacheco. The date was well chosen, for the decree on justification was ripe for judgment. On the following day the discussion on episcopal residence began.

In accordance with the vote taken the sixth solemn session was held on the 13th of January 1547.³ It was one of the most important of the whole Council, since in it the publication of the decree on justification took place. The Fathers of the Council had devoted all the more diligence and enthusiasm to this subject as it was in itself one of the most difficult questions of theology, and one in which, as Bishop de' Nobili said at the very beginning, the axe must be laid at the root of the Lutheran errors.⁴ From

¹ Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 109 *seq.*; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 454, 594. The Legates' letter to Farnese of Dec. 20 in the *Nuntiatürberichte*, IX., 401 *seq.*

² Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 111 *seq.*; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 454, 496. The Legates to Farnese, dat. Dec. 29, 1546 (*Nuntiatürberichte*, IX., 403, n. 2); PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 17, n. 1.

³ Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 121 *seq.*; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 458, 601-603; PALLAVICINI, l. 8, c. 18, n. 10-13.

⁴ See EHSES in *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XIX., 181

the 22nd to the 28th of June 1546 the questions, often most difficult, appertaining to this subject were discussed first of all by the theologians and then from the 30th of June by the bishops. The debates were very animated. At the close of the general congregation of July the 17th, as the Fathers were taking their departure, a deplorable scene took place between two hot-blooded southerners when the Greek Bishop of Crete, Zanettini, roused Sanfelice, Bishop of La Cava, to such a frenzy of anger that the latter seized his opponent by the beard and plucked out the hair.¹

The draft of a decree on justification, which had been entrusted to four bishops on the 15th of July, encountered strong opposition.² Consequently, Cardinal Cervini held a conference with a number of prominent theologians and committed to them the task of drawing up a fresh scheme. Among them was Girolamo Seripando, the learned General of the Augustinian Hermits. On the 11th of August he presented a first draft, afterwards revised at Cardinal Cervini's request, which formed the basis of the discussions conducted by Cervini together with the presiding Legate, del Monte, and many bishops and theologians.³

New propositions thus arose which were distributed on

¹ Cf. Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 444, 561.

² For the following, cf. EHSES, *Joh. Groppers Rechtfertigungslehre auf dem Konzil von Trient*, in the *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XX., 178 *seq.*, where Seripando's *memoranda in Cod. VII., D 12, of the National Library, Naples, are used for the first time. See J. HEFNER, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Trienter Rechtfertigungsdekretes*, Paderborn, 1909. Cf. further, EHSES, *Der Anteil des Augustinergenerals Seripandi an dem Trienter Dekret über die Rechtfertigungslehre*, in the *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XXIII. (1909), 3 *seqq.* The whole collection of documents will shortly be published by Eheses in his 5th vol. of the *Conc. Trid.*

³ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 569 ; EHSES, 179.

September the 23rd among the members of the general congregation. They differed to such an extent both in form and matter from those of Seripando that he could hardly recognize his original handiwork. On the 27th, 28th, and 29th of September the theologians discussed Cervini's proposals, and on the 1st of October the prelates made them the subject of a special debate which was sustained throughout with the greatest thoroughness.¹ It was in the course of these proceedings that Seripando on the 8th of October introduced the theory of a twofold justice, an inherent and an imputed—a theory already supported by certain learned and distinguished theologians in Italy and Germany. It was not his wish, however, he remarked, to affirm or deny in this question, but only to invoke the decision of the Council; if it were found that the doctrinal opinion of a twofold justice was erroneous, let it be rejected unconditionally; but if the contrary were shown to be the case, let not truth be condemned along with error; the great names of Contarini, Cajetan, Pighius, Pflug, and Gropper, on the Catholic side, ought not to be included in the disavowal of Luther, Bucer, and Calvin. It must have made a great impression when Seripando dwelt upon the necessity of submitting the apparently heterodox opinions of men who had been, and still in part were, the champions of the Church to such a full examination that no one could bring forward the charge that the Council had passed sentence against them without thoughtful consideration.²

Seripando's action gave rise to deliberations of the most thoroughgoing character not only on the doctrine of an

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 575 *seq.*; EHSES, 179 *seq.*

² See THEINER, *Acta*, I., 234, and EHSES, 180 *seq.*, who justly insists on Seripando's great services throughout the negotiations.

imputed justice, but also on the difficult question of the assurance of salvation on the part of the justified. The debates lasted from the 15th to the 26th of October, through no less than ten conferences of theologians, almost all of whom submitted their opinions in writing at great length.¹ Upholders of the most different opinions, professors of the Sorbonne and Salamanca and members of the old orders, vied with one another in giving lucidity to a question upon which even the most devoted Catholics were widely at variance. Among the new orders the Jesuits were represented by men of such conspicuous learning as Salmeron and Laynez; both had come as theologians of the Pope, and as such enjoyed a certain precedence, but the importance of their position was due primarily to their deep erudition and brilliant powers of exposition. This was particularly the case with Laynez, whose opinion given at the final sitting was one of the most influential.²

As the result of the conference of theologians the doctrine of imputed justice was rejected by thirty-two votes to five, to Seripando's bitter disappointment. Still more unfortunate was the well-intentioned but unsuccessful theory of compromise produced at the special debate of the episcopate, which lasted from the 9th of November to the 1st of December. This proposal was rejected by all the Fathers, led by the unerring conviction that inherent righteousness through God's mercy contains already everything necessary to salvation, and that the acceptance of an imputed justice is quite unnecessary in order to venerate in the justifying and redeeming grace of Christ the basis and root of the justification of man. Even Seripando, who

¹ Massarelli, *Diarium*, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 580; THEINER, *Acta*, I., 239; EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 182 *seq.*

² Best copy in GRISAR, J. Laynez, *Disput. Trid.*, II., 153 *seq.*

still defended his favourite thesis with talent and composure, could not resist the force of this argument. He practically surrendered his position by clothing his opinion in words which did little more than express what was common to both opinions.¹

In the general congregation of the 17th of December 1546 Cardinal del Monte once more drew the attention of the Fathers to a second central question: the assurance of salvation in the justified. Del Monte wished this topic, which must have caused further delay in the publication of the long-debated decree on justification, to be passed over as not strictly belonging to the subject. Cardinal Pacheco opposed him strongly. Both Cardinals had numerous followers, so that it was for long doubtful which opinion would carry the day. In the end del Monte was victorious; the article on final assurance was dropped, the Council having to restrict its decisions to publicly pronounced errors only.²

After repeated drafts, redrafts, and alterations, after thorough and impartial discussion, the decree on justification, composed with scrupulous care, was at last published on the 13th of January 1547. It contains sixteen chapters and three-and-thirty canons and is a masterpiece of theology, formulating with clearness and precision the standard of Catholic truth as distinguished from Pelagian error on the one hand and Protestant on the other.³

¹ EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 187 *seq.*

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 109.

³ With HERGENRÖTHER'S opinion (*Kirchengesch.*, II., I, 405), *cf.* that of HARNACK (*Dogmengesch.*, III., 605), who speaks of the decree "as in many respects admirably worked out," and even goes so far as to assert that "it may be doubted whether the Reformation would have developed as it did if this decree, for example, had been promulgated at the Lutheran council and had actually become incorporated into the doctrinal system of the Church." For Ranke's total misconcep-

Starting from the axiom that neither the heathen by their natural powers nor the Jews by the Mosaic law are capable of participation, *i.e.* of reaching a state of grace and of adoption as children of God, the decree first of all insists that Christ alone is the salvation of the world through the communication of the merits of His sufferings, and that only for those who believe in Him and have been born again in Him by baptism. In adults justification has its beginning in the calling of God through prevenient grace without any supernatural merit on the part of man. The latter can resist grace or co-operate with it. In both cases there is the exercise of free will, but the co-operation is also conditioned by grace.

With justification man receives not merely the forgiveness of sins but is also inwardly sanctified. This renewal also is not merely imputed as something adhering to the man from without but is a deep inward process fundamentally transforming the soul.

Faith, however, is not alone sufficient for justification, it must be accompanied by hope and love, and, as the Scripture says, faith certainly must work by love, since faith without works is dead. Faith working by love in a constant state of grace through the following of the commandments of God and the Church results in a continual advance from virtue to virtue.

In opposition to the Protestant assertion of an absolute assurance of salvation it was laid down as Catholic doctrine that no one in this life can fathom the secret of his predestination by God and, apart from a special revelation, know of a certainty that he is of the number of the elect.

tion of the decree (Päpste, I., 6th ed., 134), see *Histor.-polit. Bl.*, XXXII., 399, n. For the sense of the 22nd Canon, see STRAUB in the *Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.*, XXI., 107 *seqq.*, 208 *seqq.*

While the decree on justification was unanimously accepted in the session of January the 13th, 1547, the reform decree on episcopal residence met with manifold opposition on points of detail. Consequently, the Legates proposed to consider the objections in a general congregation and decide upon them. The 3rd of March was fixed for the next session, and the Fathers were prohibited from leaving Trent before that date. With this the momentous sixth session closed, at which the Archbishop of Spalato, Andrea Cornaro, had sung the High Mass, and the Bishop of Salpe, Tommaso Stella, preached. There were also present the two Legates, Cardinals Madruzzo and Pacheco, ten archbishops, forty-seven bishops, two procurators, five generals of orders, and two abbots. The Imperial ambassadors were absent, and the French kept themselves aloof.

With the publication of the decree on justification, produced under difficult circumstances and after long and serious labour, the Council, in its sixth session, reached the high-water mark of its endeavours.¹ Among the members there was general satisfaction over the announcement of this important decision. There was reason to believe that the Council might now proceed quickly to a finish, since with the publication of the decree the most important dogmatic decision had been reached, and nothing now remained to be done but to apply to the doctrine of the Sacraments the conclusions drawn from the premises thus established.²

The Cardinal-Legate Cervini derived such confidence from the success thus happily achieved that he no longer feared the renewed threats of a German national council and wrote to Rome that these declarations were to be

¹ Cf. KNÖPFLER in Wetzler und Welte, Kirchenlex., XI., 2nd ed., 2065.

² *Ibid.*, 2066.

received with perfect composure and answered by the offer of a Legatine mission to Germany.¹ The Pope also showed great satisfaction at the results of the sixth session.² In the answer to his instructions³ which Mendoza received before his departure from Rome on the 30th of January, the following rejoinder was made⁴ to the Imperial policy: As the contumacy of the Protestants had gone so far that Charles V. himself had found it necessary to take up arms against them, it also seemed to the Pope superfluous to interrupt the Council on their account, especially as the success of the Imperial forces offered a possibility of recalling their opponents to obedience to the Holy See. The dogmatic decrees of the Council, which in the meantime had been passed, would only be a support and not a hindrance to such a movement. Nevertheless, the Pope, in accordance with the understanding come to with Diego de Mendoza during Farnese's sojourn in Trent, had been willing to meet the Emperor's wishes in regard to the postponement of the dogmatic decisions by means of a suspension; but as Charles had not consented to this, it had been necessary to let the Council pursue its course, if it were not to dissolve automatically, which undoubtedly would be the case if the Fathers had been obliged to remain inactive in Trent. As to the Emperor's request that the article on justification should be thoroughly examined before publication, enough had undoubtedly been done, since the Council had been occupied with it for six whole months. The proposal that the decree should be

¹ Cervini to Maffei, dat. Jan. 26, 1547 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 424, n. 1).

² PALLAVICINI, l. 9, c. 1, n. 2.

³ See *supra*, p. 319.

⁴ Cf. Farnese's letter to Verello of Feb. 5, 1547 (Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 453-455; cf. *ibid.*, xxxix seq.); PALLAVICINI, l. 9, c. 3, n. 4.

submitted to the Universities before publication, as wished for by Charles V., would not only be superfluous, seeing that the opinion of these bodies was already known, but in opposition to the authority of the Council.

The labours of the Council preparatory to the seventh session were now carried on without interference from without.¹ In the general congregation of the 15th of January, del Monte proposed to the Fathers as the subject of discussion for the seventh session the dogmas of the doctrine of the Sacraments, while in relation to reform further debate would be held on the duty of episcopal residence and the abuses and obstacles connected with it. On the 17th of January Cervini distributed among them a summary of the points to be considered under the dogmatic decree, namely, fourteen errors concerning the Sacraments in general, seventeen concerning baptism, and four concerning confirmation. They were first to be treated by the theologians; after preliminary examination by the latter and division into three classes they were, on the 7th of February, again referred to the Fathers and then came before the general congregation for discussion from the 8th to the 21st of February.

As the doctrine of the Sacraments had been the subject of very detailed disquisition by Peter Lombard, St. Thomas Aquinas, and their commentators, it did not appear necessary, as with the decree on justification, to set forth the Catholic doctrine in detail and connectedly; the decree was rather to consist of canons in which the various errors should be condemned. It was the wish of some of the Fathers that the condemnation should include the authors of the false teaching by name, but this was dis-

¹ Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 123-136; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., *ibid.*, 458-465, 603-621; PALLAVICINI, l. 9, c. 1-11; KNÖPFLER, *loc. cit.*, 2066-2069.

allowed. Here also, especially in the general debate on the sacrament of the altar, which was taken beforehand, the closest examination was made of all theological questions without curtailment or hurry. The final decree, which passed on the 1st and 2nd of March, after many alterations in the original draft, consisted of a preface, thirteen canons on the Sacraments in general, fourteen on baptism, and three on confirmation.

For the preparation of the questions on reform a deputation of canonists consisting of Fathers of the Council was formed on the 20th of January. They sat, under the presidency of del Monte, from the following day until the 29th of January, when their transactions were transferred to the general congregation from the 31st of January to the 7th of February. These dealt, in part, retrospectively with the votes already given on the reform decree in the sixth session, and how they were to be regarded in conjunction with the various separate votes recorded on that occasion. During these first discussions the question was left open whether the previous decree should be taken as published or be submitted again for a final revision. It was not until the general congregation of the 24th of February, when the question of reform was resumed, that the Legates brought forward this point for settlement. On the following day it was resolved that the decree, as read at the sixth session, should be taken as accepted and approved by the majority in that assembly.¹

The new reform decree for the seventh session, consisting of fifteen chapters, was finally settled on the 26th and 28th of February. It dealt with the qualifications of nominees to bishoprics, the visitation of sees, the maintenance and repair of churches, the powers of the Cathedral Chapter

¹ Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 132-135; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., *ibid.*, 464, 617-619.

during the vacancy of a see, the conferring of orders, the approbation of the presentee, the care of hospitals, and the legal position of ecclesiastics; the combination of bishoprics and benefices in one person was made matter of special prohibition. The express nomination of Cardinals, wished for by many, was prevented from becoming subject of discussion by the Legates, on receipt of instructions from Rome, as the reform of the Sacred College was a matter belonging exclusively to the Pope; the same restriction applied to the question whether the duty of episcopal residence was of Divine law. As a matter of fact Paul III., in a consistorial decree published the 18th of February 1547, issued orders prohibiting Cardinals from holding more than one bishopric, and enjoining on them the duty of residence. Del Monte communicated this to the Fathers on the 25th of February and the 2nd of March.¹

The seventh solemn session held on the 3rd of March 1547² published the two decrees previously prepared. That on reform again called forth numerous objections from some of the Fathers. The celebrant was the Archbishop Jacopo Cauco of Corfù; the sermon was omitted, as the preacher, Bishop Martirano of S. Marco, was disabled, owing to hoarseness. Those present were the Legates and Cardinal Pacheco, nine archbishops, fifty-two bishops,³ two abbots, and five generals of orders. The next session was fixed for the 21st of April.

¹ Cf. our remarks, Vol. XI. of this work, p. 510; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 135; Massarelli, Diarium, III., *ibid.*, 619 *seq.* The decree in MERKLE, I., 621, n.

² Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 136 *seq.*; Massarelli, Diarium, II., III., ed. MERKLE, I., 465, 621 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, I. 9, c. 12.

³ List in Massarelli, Diarium, III., ed. MERKLE, I., 622. For the number, *ibid.*, n. 1.

After such a successful beginning it was not to be foreseen that the work of the Council, instead of being carried quickly forward to a fortunate end, would before long undergo an interruption of more than a year's duration. For some time complaints of the unhealthiness of Trent had been made by not a few of the Fathers. They were redoubled when, about the date of the seventh session, an infectious and in many cases fatal malady, the spotted fever (*mal di petecchie*), entered the city. It was said that, owing to the epidemic, external communication with Trent would be cut off. The fears thus aroused among the Fathers afforded an opportunity for removing the Council which the Legates on this occasion could not overlook. If the intolerable pressure which the Emperor, with his claims against the Council, brought to bear upon the Legates and Fathers, is taken into consideration, it is not difficult to understand that they made use of an opportunity, the weight of which is open to dispute, to restore independence to the Synod by withdrawal to a city removed from the reach of the dominating influence of Charles V.¹

The Legates certainly lost no time in setting to work. In a letter of the 5th of March to Farnese the presiding Cardinal-Legates asked what they were to do if the sickness continued. They did not, however, await the arrival of instructions from the Pope. As the alarm among the Fathers was further increased on the following day, the 6th of March, by the death of Bishop Loffredo of Capaccio, they judged that no more time was to be lost, and after receiving a medical certificate of the infectious character of the disease from Balduino Balduini, private physican to del Monte, and from Girolamo Fracastoro, physician to the

¹ See EHSES in Röm. Quartalschr., XIX., 184 *seq.*; cf. VERMEULEN, Die Verlegung der Konzils von Trient, Regensburg, 1890.

Council, brought the matter on the 9th of March before the general congregation. Del Monte here announced that since the session twelve prelates had left, some without having received the required permission and some without having even asked for it; others again had now declared that they would go on account of the danger of infection; it was therefore necessary that the Council should come to some decision.

The Legates, as del Monte had made known, did not wish to influence their decision, but to be guided by the voice of the majority; only they could not give their consent to the dissolution of the Synod. Pacheco raised the objection whether they had any right to discuss the removal of the Council from Trent without previous knowledge on the part of the Pope and Emperor. He asked for a few days' postponement; he had with him the Spanish, Neapolitan, and some other prelates. The great majority, however, were for the quickest possible removal from Trent; opinions only differed as to how this should take place—by suspension, or translation, or free permission to individuals to absent themselves for a certain time. The voting was deferred to the following day. Del Monte then announced that the Legates were opposed to a suspension as well as to a general dispersal, as both courses might lead to dissolution. They thought it best to translate the Council to some more suitable spot at not too great a distance from Trent; for preference they recommended Bologna as pre-eminently the most fitted. Pacheco again spoke in opposition; the Pope alone could undertake to translate the Council; such a step would arouse the displeasure of the Emperor and other princes as well as of all Christendom if taken on insufficient grounds; the prevailing sickness did not constitute such a ground, since in the opinion of local physicians it was not nearly so

serious or dangerous as Balduini and Fracastoro had represented. To the opposition of the Legates, Pacheco once more declared that the measure was one solely within the Pope's competency, the Legates could not decide without special powers to do so. Pacheco was supported by the rest of the Imperialist prelates, who presented written statements. They concluded by declaring that if the rest of the Fathers left Trent on inadequate grounds, they would remain there, and with them also the authority of the Council. Many of the majority wished to go at once to the Cathedral and there resolve on the translation, but the Legates, in order to avoid the appearance of tumultuary proceedings, put off any further action to the following day.

In this eighth session,¹ held on the 11th of March, del Monte once more gave a summary of the previous discussions on the question, made known the ascertained facts concerning the sickness, and then read aloud the draft decree of translation. After Pacheco had once more protested and Archbishop Saraceni of Matera had encountered his objections, the voting took place, which resulted in a majority of two-thirds in favour of the decree for translation to Bologna.² Del Monte now informed the Fathers for the first time that the Legates had, all along, been empowered by a Papal Bull to undertake the trans-

¹ Cf. Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 142-144; Massarelli, *Diarium*, II., III., *ibid.*, 466, 625 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, I. 9, c. 15.

² The number of votes is differently stated: Pallavicini says that out of 56 Fathers 38 "ayes" voted unconditionally and 14 "noes," 2 "ayes" conditionally and 2 with a "non liquet." VERMEULEN (p. 18 *seq.*) and KNÖPFLE (Kirchenlex., XI.,² 2070) follow this calculation. Severoli gives 34 unconditionally for and 14 unconditionally against, 2 with "non liquet." Massarelli says 39 were unconditionally in favour and 14 against, while some ("aliqui") voted conditionally and some were "neutrales."

lation of the Council, a fact which they had hitherto kept secret so as not to prejudice the freedom of decision. They then ordered the Bull of the 22nd of February 1545 to be read aloud, and forthwith announced the translation of the Council to Bologna, where on the previously appointed day, the 21st of April, the next session would be held.¹

On the same day the Legates informed Farnese of what had occurred, with a request that the Curia would take steps to see that the Council in Bologna was more numerously attended. They also addressed themselves to the nuncio Verallo, in order that he, correspondingly instructed as to the state of affairs, might defend the translation against the Emperor's objections.² On the 12th of March the Legates, with the majority of the Fathers, left Trent. On the 22nd Cervini and a certain number of bishops entered Bologna, and on the 26th he was followed by del Monte.³

¹ Sarpi's story that on the very day of the seventh session the Legates received a secret command from the Pope to transfer the Council is contradicted by PALLAVICINI (l. 9, c. 13, n. 2 *seq.*). For the entire freedom from interference from the Pope with which the translation of the Council was resolved upon, see also VERMEULEN, 20 *seq.*

² The letter of the Legates to Farnese of March 11, 1547, in the Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 651-655. Extracts from the parallel letters of the Legates to Verallo, *ibid.*, 518 n. and 652 and 654 in the notes. Cf. also the letter of Pietro Foscheri, Podestà of Trent, to Duke Ercole of Ferrara, of March 12, 1547 (*ibid.*, 655 *seq.*), and the letter by an unknown writer in an opposite sense (perhaps by one of Madruzzo's circle), *ibid.*, 656-659.

³ For the Council in Bologna and the contemporary events concerning it, cf. Massarelli, *Diarium* (IV.), de Concilio Bononiensi a 12 Martii, 1547, usque ad 10 Novembris, 1549, ed. MERKLE, I., 627-873; Severoli, ed. MERKLE, I., 144-147; PALLAVICINI, l. 9, c. 17 to l. 11, c. 6; VERMEULEN, 20 *seqq.* (cf. *Liter. Rundschau*, 1891, 355); VERMEULEN, *Das XIX. allgemeine Konzil in Bologna, Regensburg*, 1892; KNÖPFELER, *loc. cit.*, 2070-2072; Nuntiaturberichte, IX. and X.;

The Imperialist prelates, fourteen in number,¹ remained behind in Trent.

The precipitate removal of the Council to Bologna was for the Papal court as well as for all the rest of the world a surprise. The majority of the curialists rejoiced when the news reached Rome. Not so the far-seeing Pontiff, who with characteristic discernment perceived what misunderstandings might arise from a measure so hastily taken without his previous consent.² While he left the conciliar Legates in no doubt as to his private opinions,³ he did not think it right, seeing that they had acted from a real regard for his interests, to disavow them officially. The translation, in fact, was to this extent unassailable, that it had been voted for by a majority in the Council.⁴ In a consistory held on the 25th of March 1547 the Pope gave the measure his consent, the only opponents being three Cardinals, the Spaniards Juan Alvarez de Toledo and Francisco de Mendoza, to whom must be added Sadoletto.⁵

CARCERERI, *Storia esterna del Concilio di Bologna*, Montevarchi, 1903; EHSSES in the *Röm. Quartalschr.*, 1902, 429, and CARCERERI in *Arch. Trentino*, XVIII. (1903), 64 *seq.*

¹ See the list in Massarelli, *Diarium*, IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 638 *seq.* Carcereri's proposed work on "Il Concilio di Trento dalla traslazione alla sospensione" has unfortunately not yet appeared.

² Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 9, c. 16; MAYNIER, 511 *seq.*

³ He ordered Maffei to be informed that he would have preferred to have seen the Council in session at Trent for some months longer. Two further sessions would have sufficed to settle the necessary decrees, and then perhaps the Synod might have been brought to a close (PALLAVICINI, l. 9, c. 17).

⁴ See *Wiener Jahrb. der Litteratur*, CXV., 115.

⁵ PALLAVICINI (l. 9, c. 16) gives with Massarelli, *Diarium*, IV., ed. MERKLE, 633, the 23rd March, while the detailed report of Bonifazio Ruggieri places the consistory on the 24th (*Nuntiatgeberichte*, IX., 528, n. 1). In the *Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican) the date is not entered.

From the first Paul III., supported by Farnese, made every effort to prevent this unexpected incident from increasing the tension which already existed between him and the Emperor. But the ambassador Vega would hear of no excuses; to the assurance that the Pope had not been a party to the translation he refused to give the slightest credence.¹

Charles V. was of the same opinion. On the 17th of March he had despatched a courier to Rome with instructions for Vega bidding the latter to express his extreme displeasure to the Pope and to demand the immediate recall of the Council to Trent. The ambassador, who received this command on the 24th of March, delivered his message on the same evening. Before the audience Cardinal Farnese adjured him to show moderation and "to throw water rather than fuel on the fire." "I bring neither water nor fuel," replied Vega, "but intend to carry out his Majesty's behests." As Paul III. was also much excited, the interview would have been a stormy one if the Pope at the last moment had not exercised a wise self-control. He calmly explained to Vega that he had taken no part in the proceedings that had led to the translation of the Council. The measure had been as great a surprise to him as to the Emperor. As the Council had agreed to the measure by a majority of more than two-thirds, he could not recall the Synod to Trent without derogating from its freedom; moreover, the sickness was still prevalent there. Should the Council resolve spontaneously to return, that would be all the more agreeable to him, as thereby the Emperor's wishes would be realized. But it was desirable that the Synod should first assemble in its entirety at the place to which it had been legitimately translated. Charles V. would therefore

¹ See Maffei's letter of March 26 and Farnese's of April 5, 1547, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 527 *seq.*, 530 *seq.*

do well to permit the bishops who had remained in Trent to proceed to Bologna, as thereby they would have the advantage of being able more easily to induce the other Fathers to return to Trent for the reasons adduced by the Emperor. The sojourn in Bologna could not be looked upon as suspicious since, as a matter of fact, a greater number of Councils had been held even in Rome itself.

Bologna, moreover, was encircled by territories the princes of which were known to be the most loyal adherents of the Emperor. This great city again offered all the necessary requisites for the tenure of such an assembly, just as it was suited for the eventual meeting in person of the Pope and the Emperor. Finally, what concerned the security of the Council, which Charles was bound to guarantee, could only be discussed when necessity demanded, a necessity, however, which at present had not arisen. Paul III. added, in conclusion, that if the Emperor considered himself to be the eldest son of the Church, he at the same time could not forget that as Pope, albeit unworthy, he was the Church's head.¹

Verallo repeated the substance of these declarations on the 14th of April 1547 in an audience granted to him in Plauen by Charles V.

The Emperor, who had been suffering all through the winter, had for a long time intended to leave the subjection of the Saxon Elector, John Frederick, to his brother Ferdinand and the Margrave Albert of Culmbach; he thought of going himself to Frankfort-on-Main and from there conducting his operations against Philip of Hesse.²

¹ See Farnese's report of April 5, 1547 (*ibid.*, 531 *seq.*; here also is the report of the envoy of Ferrara), and that of Vega of March 26, 1547, in MAYNIER, 516, n. 1.

² See MAURENBRECHER, 54* *seq.*, and RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, IV., 6th ed., 369.

He was moved, however, to change his plans¹ by the news that John Frederick had, on March the 2nd, succeeded in taking prisoner the Margrave Albert in Rochlitz and that Ferdinand was threatened by the Bohemian Utraquists. Against the advice of his physician he resolved to hasten with all possible speed with his whole army to the aid of his brother and Duke Maurice, in order to deliver in person a decisive blow against John Frederick. By the 13th of April he had already crossed the Saxon frontier. His first night encampment was at Adorf, the second at Plauen.

The audience which Verallo had to undergo in the latter place made his position almost untenable. He would never believe, declared Charles, breaking in upon the nuncio's representations, that the translation of the Council took place without the Pope's knowledge, since the latter had never wished the Synod to meet in Trent; as for the outbreak of an epidemic, that was merely a pretext. On Verallo remarking that the Pope would not recall a decree of the Council, the Emperor interposed that he had long known well that the Pope knew how to turn things so as to bring them into accordance with his own wishes. He added angrily: "The Pope thinks of nothing but to prolong his days, to aggrandize his family, to heap up riches; in order to attain his own ends he rejects the duties of his high office. We know him. He is an obstinate old man, who is working for the destruction of the Church. Those who promised to submit themselves to the Council of Trent have now a just excuse for rejecting the Council of Bologna. But there will be a council forthcoming which shall correspond to the wishes of all Christendom and remove all abuses. We know the full extent of our authority, and that it belongs to us as

¹ Commentaries, 179. For the threats against Ferdinand I., see HUBER, IV., 125 *seq.*

Emperor to secure the freedom of the Council whether men wish it or not. If necessary we shall send the bishops not merely to Bologna but to Rome, and lead them thither in person."

Verallo tried to defend the Pope from such immoderate attacks. He remarked, among other observations, that the bishops who were in Bologna had gone there of their own free will, while those in Trent remained there at his Majesty's pleasure. It must therefore be said of the latter that they were deprived of freedom; no one could assert that of the former. This very apposite remark had such an effect on the Emperor that he exclaimed: "Go, nuncio; I am not going to argue with you. When you have any business to transact, take it to Granvelle."¹

Ten days after this audience the arbitrament was settled on the field of Mühlberg on the Elbe; the Emperor in a few hours broke up the whole Saxon army and took the Elector John Frederick prisoner. It was not a battle, said Melanchthon, but a helter-skelter rout.² The Imperialist loss amounted to about fifty men, including those who succumbed later to their wounds. Of the Electoral troops more than 2000 fell. They lost all their banners, 21 guns, and 600 waggons with munitions and stores.³

On the 5th of May the Emperor stood before Wittemberg; on the 19th a treaty was there concluded, the terms of which included John Frederick's renunciation of the

¹ See Verallo's report, written also on April 14, 1547, in the *Nuntiatürberichte*, IX., 536 *seq.*, and Charles V.'s letter to Mendoza of April 15, 1547, in MAURENBRECHER, 106* *seq.*, and MAYNIER, 520, n. 1.

² Corp. ref., VI., 587.

³ See LENZ, *Die Schlacht bei Mühlberg*, Gotha, 1879; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 659 *seq.*; Venet. *Depeschen*, II., 234 *seq.*; *Nuntiatürberichte*, IX., 547.

Electorate and the surrender of all his fortresses. The overthrow of the Elector was followed by the submission of the Lower Saxon Circle and on June the 19th by that of Philip of Hesse. Utterly discouraged and intimidated, the latter prince surrendered at discretion. The Emperor handed him over, like the Elector, to strict custody.¹ The victory was complete, and more brilliant than the cautious Emperor had dared to hope.

The news of the overwhelming success in north Germany made all the deeper impression in Rome² as shortly before deceptive reports had been received of the long struggle with his adversaries that still awaited Charles V. Instead of that the monarch, who had indulged in such menacing language to Verallo, had reached a fulness of power which no Roman-Germanic Emperor had possessed for centuries. The Pope's fears of Charles V. were increased, for with the death of Francis I. on March the 31st the check which he had hoped to find in France became very insecure. Not only did the Imperialist Montmorency regain his influence with the new King, but Henry II. also showed himself indisposed to favour a Council over which Papal influence prevailed.³ Consequently, the new ambassador, Diego Mendoza, who had taken Vega's place on the 11th of April, found Paul III. much more accessible. Even when Mendoza brought out his threats of an Imperial protest and a national council Paul III. maintained his composure unruffled.⁴ At the same time the Fathers in Bologna carried concession so far as to determine on the 19th of April to put off the publication of the decree until

¹ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 661, 663 *seqq.*

² Cf. CAMPANA, 393, 394.

³ See DRUFFEL, Sfondrato, 322-324.

⁴ See Ruggieri's report of April 30, 1547, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., xxxii, n. 2.

the 2nd of June and in the session fixed for the 21st of April only to announce its prorogation.¹

The victory of Mühlberg was first announced to Paul III. by Mendoza² and then in a letter from Ferdinand I. of the 25th of April.³ The Pope answered on the 20th of May;⁴ ten days later he wrote a letter of congratulation to the Emperor,⁵ and the event was celebrated by a solemn service in St. Peter's.

Cardinal Farnese was at this time in a fever of anxiety to compose the differences between the Emperor and the Pope. With Mendoza on the one hand, with the Pope and powerful Cardinals such as Morone, Crescenzi, Ardinghello, and Santafiora on the other, he kept up indefatigable negotiations. He was successful in arriving at an arrangement with Charles V. on the promised subsidies from the Spanish Church. After Mendoza had agreed that the sum to be raised on the sale of conventual property was not to exceed 400,000 ducats, the Pope gave his consent to the preparation of the necessary Bull, although it seemed to him that, in view of the most recent events, the Emperor's opposition to the translation of the Council and the uselessness of the victory in Germany for the Church, he might well have refused.⁶

Cardinal Farnese held out hopes to the Imperialists of

¹ See Massarelli, *Diarium*, IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 642; PALLAVICINI, I. 9, c. 20, n. 4.

² *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 532, 538.

³ This letter is published in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, IX., 677 *seq.*, from the draft in Court and State Archives, Vienna.

⁴ See **Brevia Pauli III.* (Arm., 41, t. 39, n. 475, Secret Archives of the Vatican) in Appendix No. 34.

⁵ RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 101. On July 29 Paul III. congratulated Ferdinand on the successes in Bohemia (see *ibid.*, n. 104).

⁶ See Farnese to Verallo, dat. May 31, 1547 (*Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 5); cf. DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, I., 84.

further generous support in money. Even Paul III. expressed himself favourably on this point. Farnese left Mendoza in no doubt as to the leading motive of his busy efforts at mediation; an arrangement, he thought, might be reached on all points if only the Emperor would invest Pier Luigi with Parma and Piacenza or Siena.¹ On the conciliar question Farnese and Mendoza were united on a middle course, the acceptance of which, however, by the Emperor was very doubtful. This was that the Council should again return to Trent or to some neighbouring city in German territory, as soon as the Emperor should have ascertained that the Diet or the individual Estates of Germany had pledged themselves to place the questions of religion under the arbitrament of the reassembled Council or to accept the decrees of that Synod. In the meantime the Fathers who had not left Trent should betake themselves to Bologna and there, while for the present avoiding dogmatic questions, continue to deal exclusively with measures of reform.²

Paul III. had refused at first to make any concessions on the question of the Council, having remarked to Mendoza that Christ had addressed to St. Peter and not to the Emperor the words: Upon this rock will I build my church.³ Nevertheless he at last turned an ear to the new proposals, and on May the 31st Cardinal Sfondrato, who had already started on his journey to the Emperor on the 22nd of April, was given full powers to enter upon the arrangement agreed upon between Mendoza and Farnese.⁴

¹ See Mendoza's reports in DÖLLINGER, I., 57 *seq.*; *cf.* DE LEVA, 323 *seq.*

² Nuntiaturberichte, X., xxxiii, 3 *seq.*

³ PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 1.

⁴ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 2 *seq.* For the deep-seated distrust of Charles V. on the part of Paul III., *cf.* Legazioni di A. Serristori, 161 *seq.*

Before this suggestions had come from Rome to Bologna, where the Emperor's victory also had been celebrated, to await the result of the negotiations with Mendoza and to postpone the next session until the middle of August. The Fathers at Bologna therefore determined to fix a date later than the 2nd of June, the day appointed for the future session, since the Pope wished it; the 15th of September was accordingly the day chosen.¹

This concession was due mainly to the hope entertained in Bologna as well as in Rome that Cardinal Sfondrato, in his Legatine capacity, would allay the quarrel with Charles V. This noble Milanese seemed to be the right man for the task, as in former days he had once done good service in the cause of Imperial policy. In addition to his previous instructions to obtain Charles's consent to an undertaking against England, he was also to secure from him the recognition of the Council at Bologna or at least a pledge that he would not take any measures detrimental to its success. Then, as an after-thought, he was to introduce the subject of the joint proposal of mediation in the matter of the Council arranged by Mendoza and Farnese.²

Cardinal Sfondrato, who entered on his difficult mission in no sanguine mood, travelled very slowly. It was the beginning of July 1547 when he first met the Emperor at Bamberg, where, on the 4th of that month, he had an audience. Charles accorded a friendly reception to the Legate, who first congratulated him on the victorious close of the campaign, but refused curtly and firmly to interfere in

¹ See Massarelli, *Diarium IV.*, ed. MERKLE, I., 658 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 1; DE LEVA, IV., 321 *seq.*

² See DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, I., 54 *seqq.*; DRUFFEL, *Beiträge*, I., 51 *seq.*, and Sfondrato, 374 *seq.*; *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., xxiv; here (xxii *seq.*) there is also more concerning the personalities of the Legates. Cf. also for Sfondrato, *Arch. stor. Lomb.*, 1894, 27 *seqq.*

English affairs. Germany, where enough still remained to be done, was nearer his thoughts ; he had, especially after his recent experiences, no inclination to look after the business of other people as commander-in-chief, and finally declared himself heartily sick of campaigning. Sfondrato, with eulogiums of Mendoza, then introduced the subject of mediation with regard to the Council, but here also the Emperor, determined on the unconditional meeting of the Synod at Trent, met him with a positive refusal. In the proposal that the Diet, before the return of the Council to Trent, should declare its submission to the conciliar decrees, Charles saw only a purposely devised scheme to get rid of the Council altogether. He said this openly, and remarked that methods would not be wanting of counteracting such a decision. The Legate dismissed this suspicion as unfounded, so far as the Pope was concerned, and insisted that it was against the dignity of the Council to be again recalled to Trent out of consideration for the German nation, if no guarantee were given that that very nation would suspend its hostility towards the Synod. When the Legate at last requested the Emperor at least to ratify the acceptance of the decrees as they now stood, while the stamp of victory was fresh upon him, he received a scornful rebuff. As he perceived, said Charles, that the Legate had been well instructed on all points, nothing remained for him to say save that in matters of religion he would do his duty and hoped that others would do the same. The Legate replied that this was also the intention of the Pope, and it followed that the only difference lay in the choice of means towards that end. He begged his Majesty to give the matter more mature consideration, as the proposals of mediation had commended themselves to Mendoza. The Emperor, however, rejoined that it would not be astonishing if Mendoza had made a mistake. It would not be neces-

sary for him now to give the matter further reflection, since he had devoted more thought to this than to the war itself. After this hard refusal of all his proposals, the Legate asked if, in view of the fruitlessness of further discussion, it would not be better that he should withdraw, to which the Emperor replied coldly "that he might do as he chose."¹

The Emperor's rudeness and inflexibility made such an impression on Sfondrato that together with his official report on the 7th of July he sent a private letter to Farnese in which he implored him to come round on the question of the Council and at least to support a suspension of the Synod at Bologna, as otherwise there was a great danger of the powerful Emperor provoking a schism. The Legate was confirmed in this opinion by the continued discourtesy of Charles, who for a long time refused him any audience on the pretext of indisposition. Alba, Soto, and Madruzzo also begged Sfondrato, in the interests of the Church, to induce the Pope to consent to the return of the Council to Trent.²

In a letter to Maffei on the 31st of July, Sfondrato wrote that he would rather incur the blame of the public at large by advising a course of conduct unpopular at Rome than burden his conscience by silence. The Emperor, he set forth in a memorial sent at the same time, is unchangeable in his demand that the Council should return to Trent. If he is told that this cannot possibly be done without the consent of the Council, he replies that it depends solely and entirely on the Pope. If it is suggested that the Council of Trent has waited already two whole years for the German nation and that the Emperor now has the power in his

¹ See Sfondrato's report to Farnese of July 7, 1547, in the *Nuntiatürberichte*, X., 35 *seqq.* Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 3; DRUFFEL, Sfondrato, 328 *seq.*

² *Nuntiatürberichte*, X., 39 *seq.*, 43 *seq.*, 53 *seq.*, and DRUFFEL, *loc. cit.*, 332 *seq.*

hands to force that nation to return to the Church, the Imperial rejoinder is, that that is only possible by means of the Council and that the Council must be assembled in Trent. If it is pointed out that Trent cannot offer adequate certainty of freedom to the Council, the Imperial contradiction is ready that numerous decrees on dogma have been passed there in opposition to the express orders of the Emperor. If it is pointed out that in the case of Paul III.'s death the Council in Trent might introduce some innovation in the mode of Papal election or, *vacante sede*, some reform disadvantageous to the Holy See, the counter-allegation is raised that the very same objections were mooted when Trent was originally proposed as the seat of the Council and yet were at that time rejected. Besides, the same reasons are adducible also in the case of Bologna.¹

In Rome, Sfondrato's behaviour was subjected to strong criticism. The most important Cardinals, Farnese, Crescenzi, Morone, Ardinghello, and Santaflora, took exception to the nuncio's precipitate declarations on his first audience.² The situation was made more complicated by an illness which for eight days incapacitated the Pope from holding audiences. It was only a case of obstinate catarrh; but at Paul III.'s great age even a slight indisposition might lead to fatal results. In that event it was more than doubtful that a Council would be held on German soil. No one, it was the general opinion, could, under such circumstances, feel perfectly certain of the security of the Papal election.³

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 64 *seqq.*

² See the report, *ibid.*, 55, n. 1.

³ Cf. DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 80, 91, 97; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 55, n. 1; BUCHOLTZ, VI., 198, and Paolo Mario's *report to the Duchess of Urbino, dat. Rome, July 15, 1547 (State Archives, Florence), who insists on medical evidence on the strength of Paul's constitution.

Paul III. took counsel with his confidential advisers on the 17th of July as to what should be done. It was determined that the Council must remain free, and decide for itself whether it would return to Trent or move elsewhere. The Pope, reported the Florentine envoy on July the 18th, was much annoyed at the Emperor for not waiting until the Diet of the Empire met, but simply demanding the recall to Trent. That incited the Pope to equal obstinacy. Moreover, he certainly was counting upon the Emperor's want of money, his preoccupation with German affairs, and the probability that he might have to face difficulties in Italy as well.¹ The last remark referred to the Papal endeavours to prepare the way for an alliance with France and to extend this into a formal anti-imperialist coalition. Mendoza, who was informed of these intrigues, displayed no alarm. There is always talk going on, he said, of alliances against the Emperor, but these are so formed that the treaties have hardly been concluded before they end in a competition of all the allies for reconciliation with the object of their attack.²

¹ See Serristori's letter in the *Nuntiatürberichte*, X., 55, n. 1.

² Cf. DE LEVA, IV., 319; *Nuntiatürberichte*, X., xxxix; BROSCHE, I., 183; *Mitteil. des österr. Instituts*, XXIII., 141. The alliance with France was to be sealed by the marriage of Orazio Farnese with Diane de Poitiers; the betrothal took place in June 1547 (*Nuntiatürberichte*, X., 62, n. 1; cf. *Atti d. soc. Ligur.*, VIII., Doc. 105). On June 29, 1547, the wedding of Vittoria Farnese with the Duke of Urbino was celebrated (see Mendoza's report in DÖLLINGER, I., 90; cf. also FELICIANGELI, 218). While the marriage was being arranged the Duke's younger brother, Giulio della Rovere (cf. MANNI, *Osserv. s. i sigilli antichi*, VII., 31; X., 143), was promised the red hat (DÖLLINGER, I., 69, 81; RIBIER, II., 25). When on July 27, 1547, a nomination of Cardinals took place, the only one named was Charles Guise of Lorraine, a second (Giulio) was reserved *in petto* (see the *report of Paolo Mario to the Duke of Urbino of July 27, 1547, in the State Archives, Florence, whereby CIACONIUS, III., 724 *seq.*, and

Although many expressed themselves in favour of a return to Trent, the Pope remained firm in his refusal, and with all the more tenacity as the prospects of the Council at Bologna were improving. It seemed as insupportable as ever that the Emperor, the head of secular dominion, should arrogate to himself the final decision in the spiritual sphere as well.¹

From this certainly justifiable standpoint the Pope would not budge for some time longer; but at last he recoiled in alarm at the incalculable consequences of a complete breach with the victorious monarch. Cardinals Farnese and Crescenzi supported Mendoza's representations, who, in accordance with his master's instructions, did not omit to utter threats of a solemn protest against the Synod of Bologna.² Thus the Pope decided to make a partial surrender. At the beginning of September the following agreement was come to at the Pope's summer residence in Foligno. The sitting of the Council fixed for the 15th of September was postponed until the situation as developed by the Diet of Augsburg should be made known; in the interval no conciliar acts were to be undertaken; therefore the prorogation, which was to be for an indefinite time, was only settled in a simple congregation. If a session were appointed the Pope was to give fourteen days' notice to the Spanish ambassador. Paul III.,

CARDELLA, IV., 284 *seq.*, are to be corrected). Giulio's publication with that of Charles de Bourbon did not take place until Jan. 9, 1548 (see DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 90). The coat of arms of Cardinal G. della Rovere in the Pinacoteca of Todi, with the then customary Cardinal's hat with six tassels, in PASINI-FRASSONI, I cappelli prelatizi Roma, 1908, 10.

¹ See MAURENBRECHER, 149; DRUFFEL, Sfondrato, 335 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 86, n. 2.

² Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, X., 87, n. 1, 515.

Cardinal Farnese, and the Legates at Bologna gave their word that the agreement would be observed.¹

At this juncture a deed of blood, the assassination of Pier Luigi Farnese, the Pope's son, by the Imperialist Viceroy, Ferrante Gonzaga, cut asunder the threads which had just been reunited and threw all things into confusion.

The Italian policy of Charles V. had undergone a decided change since the appointment of Ferrante Gonzaga as Viceroy of Milan. With the zeal of a genuine renegade this man had courted the favour of the Emperor by stirring up his animosity against the Italians.² The determination of the Spaniards to strengthen, by annexations, the position which the possession of Milan and Naples gave them became clearer day by day. Besides enterprises in Genoa and Siena, the acquisition of Parma and Piacenza was further aimed at.³ As early as June 1546 the Emperor had let Ferrante Gonzaga understand that he was only awaiting the death of the aged Pope to destroy Pier Luigi.⁴ The latter had formed close connections with the French and was in association with all in Italy by whom the Spanish supremacy was regarded as unbearable. The Imperialists believed that in the conspiracy of Fiesco in Genoa the traces of the Farnese influence were to be discerned.⁵

The plan of Ferrante Gonzaga to overthrow his incon-

¹ Cf. MAYNIER, 530 *seq.*; DE LEVA, IV., 339; DRUFFEL, Sfondrato, 344; Nuntiaturberichte, X., xxxv, 106 *seqq.*, 557 *seq.*, 569. In Bologna in a general congregation of Sept. 14, 1547, the next session was postponed *sine die* (Massarelli, Diarium IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 695).

² Cf. Mocenigo's report in FIEDLER, 130.

³ See MAURENBRECHER, 155 *seq.*, 159; BALAN, VI., 391.

⁴ See AFFÒ, 112; DE LEVA, IV., 355.

⁵ Cf. DE LEVA, IV., 240 *seq.*, 244 *seq.*; BELGRANO in Arch. stor. Ital., 3rd Series, IV., 1, 216 *seq.*; LANDAU in the Allgem. Zeitung, 1887, Beil. 35, who considers the evidence of Paul III.'s participation inconclusive; so also MANFRONI, 365 *seq.*

venient and dangerous neighbour, with whom personal dissensions were constantly breaking out, was favoured by the internal conditions of the Duchy of Parma-Piacenza. Pier Luigi had here made for himself more bitter enemies by the rigour of his administration and the harsh assertion of his territorial authority than by his dissolute life. In general his government was no better and no worse than that of most of the petty Italian princes of that day. Like Cosimo de' Medici he also strove to form a homogeneous state out of the conflicting portions of his domain, but in this attempt he came into collision, before all others, with the insubordinate nobility. Accustomed to the lenient rule of the Church, these small barons chafed impatiently under the strong hand of the new ruler who, in proportion as he improved the condition of the people, set limits to the feudal privileges of their masters.¹

The dissatisfaction grew when Pier Luigi formed under his own immediate command a territorial militia and, with characteristic disregard for others, began to erect in Parma as well as in Piacenza a huge citadel. By the end of 1546 Ferrante Gonzaga had made proposals to the Emperor that he should employ the discontented nobles to overthrow Farnese.² Impressed by Farnese's attitude towards the

¹ The first supporter of this view of Farnese, who had been appointed simply in the first instance as "Tiranno," is L. SCARABELLI: *Dell'ultima ducea di Pier Luigi Farnese*, Bologna, 1868. This defence, which certainly goes too far here and there (*cf.* Arch. stor. Ital., 3rd Series, IX., 2, 226 *seq.*), has been adopted by REUMONT (III., 2, 501), BALAN (VI., 395), BERTOLOTTI (in the *Atti dell' Emilia*, III., 27 *seq.*, 49 *seq.*), and GIARELLI (*Storia di Piacenza*, Piacenza, 1889). Recently SCAPINELLI has treated the question from the like point of view (*Rassegna naz.*, I. [1906], 182 *seq.*, *Le riforme sociali del duca Pier Luigi*) and MASSIGNAN (p. 61 *seq.*, *cf.* p. 111 *seq.*).

² See Gonzaga's letter of Dec. 30, 1546, in MAURENBRECHER, 156, n. 15. For the building of the citadel of Piacenza, see *Atti Mod.* I.,

conspiracy of Fiesco, the Emperor listened to Ferrante's schemes with assent, but only in the case of a vacancy in the Holy See.¹ Ferrante Gonzaga, embittered by personal quarrels and constantly goaded on by Doria against Farnese,² was loath to wait so long; he tried hard to obtain the Emperor's permission to hazard an early blow. In the spring of 1547 he set forth in detail how favourable the situation was for securing Parma and Piacenza by a sudden stroke.³ But Charles V. had fresh scruples; he turned with a shudder from Gonzaga's murderous plot when it lay before him point by point; and he was also struck by the unwisdom of thus directly conjuring up the vengeance of the Pope. But afterwards, when the translation of the Council took place, he gave his consent on May the 31st to the forcible expulsion of Pier Luigi.⁴

Ferrante Gonzaga without delay made all the necessary arrangements with the malcontent nobles. Seeing that the works of the citadel of Piacenza were far advanced, and that there was a danger of the conspirators making an alliance with France, he urged upon the Emperor that the moment to strike had come at last. The latter gave his consent, but on the emphatic condition that the Duke's life should be spared. Gonzaga was at pains to obtain a

480 *seq.*; MASSIGNAN, 71 *seq.* Cf. Arch. stor. Ital., 4th Series, XIV., 105.

¹ See Charles V. to Gonzaga, Jan. 14, 1547, in the Atti d. Soc. Ligur., VIII., Doc. 36, and in MAURENBRECHER, 157.

² Scipio de Castro insists on this in the *Avvertimenti et ricordi al duca di Terranova, governat. di Milano, in the Inf. polit., XII., f. 17^b, of the Royal Library, Berlin. Another copy in the Ambrosian Library, Milan.

³ See the documents in ODORICI, 67 *seq.*; AFFÒ, 145 *seq.*; DE LEVA, IV., 357 *seq.*

⁴ See MAURENBRECHER, 157; DE LEVA, IV., 361 *seq.*

promise from the conspirators, with the express approval of Charles;¹ but they firmly refused to enter into the conditions laid down by the Emperor. Gonzaga therefore let it drop and, indeed, assured all the participators in the deed of immunity from punishment for all murders committed in the execution of their design. After all the preparations had been made with scrupulous care a postponement was caused by the presence of Ottavio Farnese with his father.²

Ottavio had hardly taken his departure when the conspirators made ready for their crime. While the Duke, for whom his astrologer had predicted length of years, sat at table at midday on the 10th of September 1547 with a brilliant retinue, foreboding no evil, the murderers stole one by one into the citadel of Piacenza, unhindered by the unsuspecting German bodyguard. After the Duke had risen from table Count Giovanni Anguissola and two privy to the plot forced their way into his chamber and struck him down with a dagger. The rest of the band had in the meantime overpowered the guard and taken possession of the citadel. In vain Alessandro Tommasoni, commander of the ducal troops, tried to penetrate within the main building, from the window of which the bleeding corpse of Pier Luigi was flung into the trench.³

¹ Cf. AFFÒ, 157 *seq.*, 178 *seq.*; MAURENBRECHER, 158.

² Cf. AFFÒ, 164 *seq.*; ODORICI, 93 *seq.*; DE LEVA, 363 *seq.*

³ Cf. FALETI, 370 *seq.*; ADRIANI, VI., 2; AFFÒ, 179 *seq.*; ODORICI, 53 *seq.*; BALAN, VI., 394; BERTOLOTTI, *La morte di P. L. Farnese; Processo e lettere ined.* (*Atti dell' Emilia*, III., 1, 25 *seqq.*; MASSIGNAN, 98 *seq.*). For the chief of the conspirators, G. Anguissola, and his relations with Spain, see BONARDI in *Arch. stor. Lomb.*, 1895. The murder gave rise to several pamphlets deploring the crime (see *Lamento p. la morte di P. L. Farnese p. da G. CAPASSO*, Parma, 1894). Marmitta addressed poem of condolence to Paul III. (see *Atti Mod.*, I., 153).

Among the people the murder met with no response ; the city authorities likewise would not hear of any change of government. Nevertheless, the fate of Piacenza was already decided. Ferrante Gonzaga hastened thither and on the 12th of September occupied the city in the Emperor's name, after promising the conspirators on Charles's behalf that the city should never again be delivered to the Pope or a Farnese. It was only the vigilance of the commandant that prevented Parma also from falling into the Imperialists' hands. On the 16th of September, Ottavio, the murdered man's eldest son, had already made his entry.¹

This terrible blow, which seemed to many contemporaries to be the punishment of heaven for the Pope's inordinate nepotism, struck the Pontiff like a lightning flash from a clear sky. On that very 10th of September Paul III., then staying in Perugia, had an interview with Mendoza in which he talked of the course of his career and extolled his luck.² On that same day, and perhaps at the self-same hour, his son fell dead at the hand of the assassin.

Deeply as the Pope must have felt this calamity as a father and as a sovereign, yet the aged man, weak in body and vigorous in mind, never lost his composure for a moment. When Cardinal Farnese brought him the fearful tidings he only lamented that he was too fortunate and therefore open to such a counter-stroke ; but this event was

¹ Cf. AFFÒ, 181 *seq.* ; DE LEVA, IV., 369 ; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 114, 115 n.

² See Mendoza's report of Sept. 18, 1547, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 114. The good fortune of Paul III. was the subject of letter from Gioivo (Lettere 32), June 1547. For the stay in Perugia, see BONTEMPI, 394 ; cf. *Acta Consist., "Die iovis 25 Augusti 1547 S. D. N. discessit ab urbe Perusiam versus. Die veneris ultima Septembris 1547 fuit reditus S. S. a civitate Perusiae ad alnam urbem" (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican).

indeed too hard a blow.¹ To save Piacenza, whose magistrates had sent him a letter of condolence on the 10th of September with assurances of loyalty,² he despatched on the 13th Cardinal Cervini as Legate in order to rescue that city for the States of the Church.³ By whom the blow had been delivered was not long a mystery to Paul III. By the 15th of September he was firmly convinced that all must have been done with the connivance of the Emperor and his servants, especially Ferrante.⁴

Such then were the circumstances under which the question of the Council and that of the reorganization of religion in Germany awaited a final solution.

¹ See Ruggieri's report of Sept. 17, 1547, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 115, n. 1; *cf. ibid.*, 116. The terrible news reached Perugia on Sept. 12 (BONTEMPI, 394) and was known in Rome on the 14th (see *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 522; Legaz. di A. Serristori, 160 *seq.*).

² Printed in *Spicil. Vatic.*, I. (1890), 74. There is a similar letter to Cardinal A. Farnese of Sept. 10, 1547, in the archives of the Spanish Embassy at Rome.

³ *Brief to Cardinal Cervini, dat. Perusiae (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 40, n. 745; Secret Archives of the Vatican); original in the State Archives, Naples.

⁴ See F. Rodi's *report of Sept. 15, 1547, in BALAN, VI., 395; *cf. also* Legazioni di A. Serristori, 161; *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 115, n. 1; DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 121.

CHAPTER X.

THE EMPEROR IN OPPOSITION TO THE POPE AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE COUNCIL.

IN the German war Charles V. had made a brilliant display of his superiority over all his opponents: the Schmalkaldic League was shattered, and its leaders, the Saxon Elector and the Landgrave of Hesse, made prisoners. The Emperor seemed to have reached the summit of his power. The reorganization of the religious condition of Germany, which had been suspended during the war, no longer admitted of any postponement. With the destruction of the political power of the Protestant Estates only one-half of the task assigned to himself by Charles was fulfilled; the other and more difficult half had now to be accomplished: the restoration of religious unity. Deeply convinced of the truth of Catholic doctrine, the Emperor sincerely desired this unity, but only in the sense that he, the temporal head of Christendom, should outweigh in influence the spiritual head, the Pope.

As protector of the Church the Emperor held himself to be justified in claiming not only in the political but also in the ecclesiastical sphere the casting vote on all critical questions. Paul III., who saw clearly through this pretension, was not disposed, however, to sink himself to the level of an Imperial vassal or chaplain. It was by no means his nepotism only, but rather his determination from a sense of duty to preserve his independence and freedom as Pope which drew Paul III. into antagonism to the

monarch "who wished to have all Italy at his free disposal, to secularize in Spain, to dictate in Trent, and to adjudicate at his own tribunal on the great controversy on religion in Germany."¹

The opposition between the two potentates, which had been declared openly during the Schmalkaldic war, appeared to have reached the point of rupture when Pier Luigi fell murdered at Imperial instigation and simultaneously Piacenza was seized without a semblance of legal right² by Ferrante Gonzaga, the Emperor's viceroy in Milan.

The situation was now made worse by the unworthy behaviour of the Imperialists towards the aged Pope and his Legate, Cardinal Sfondrato. At first the most deliberate dissimulation was practised in order to prove that the assassination had taken place without the Emperor's knowledge. Already on the evening of the 13th of September 1547 Granvelle hastened to Sfondrato and showed him a letter from Ferrante Gonzaga assuring the Emperor's minister that the first news of the murder had just reached him, after the event. On the 16th Granvelle came once more to announce that Piacenza had surrendered to the Emperor. Sfondrato was not at a loss to declare that the speedy re-delivery of the city to Ottavio Farnese, the murdered man's son and son-in-law of the Emperor, must be the touchstone of his innocence as regards the catastrophe and of his uprightness of intention towards the Pope.³

¹ BEZOLD, *Gesch. der Reformation*, 795; *cf.* also RANKE, *Deutsche Gesch.*, 6th ed., V., 77.

² See BROSCH (I., 186), who describes Ferrante's act as that of a bandit.

³ See Sfondrato's letter of Sept. 17 in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 117 *seqq.*

It was not until two days later that Sfondrato had an opportunity, after a High Mass, of seeing Charles, who had been laid up for some time with gout. The latter remarked on this occasion of his own accord and with every apparent sign of sorrow, that he had heard of the events at Piacenza with no other feelings than those of indignation both on account of the murdered Duke himself and of the Pope, and that he was longing for the arrival of an envoy from Gonzaga with fuller information. The Cardinal-Legate, knowing very well that the occasion did not permit of further discussion, confined himself to requesting the Emperor to take such measures as would be consonant with his lofty station, his justice, and his high reputation.¹

After the arrival of Ferrante's emissary Granvelle once more gave assurance of the viceroy's innocence. He had found himself compelled to comply with the invitation of the inhabitants of Piacenza themselves, who would otherwise have handed over the city to the French; among the conditions to which he had to agree was one prohibiting the transfer of Piacenza either to the family of Farnese or to the Papal States. The Legate rejoined that he did not intend to investigate the question of Gonzaga's innocence; he was content with the fact that the city was occupied by Imperialist troops while belonging by every title of law to Ottavio Farnese. Granvelle replied vaguely that the Emperor would give orders such as the occasion required, but that astonishment was felt that no instructions had come from the Pope. The Legate was able to reply, with reason, that it was the duty of the Emperor and the person who had taken possession to give explanation to the Pope, who was the injured, and, he

¹ See Sfondrato's despatch of Sept. 18, 1547, in PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 5, n. 4; also partly in Nuntiaturberichte, X., 120, n. 1.

might add, the plundered party. Hereupon Granvelle assured him that such had been the Emperor's intention, but that he had awaited the arrival of Gonzaga's envoy and also had been afraid of a summons to the French from Piacenza. Sfondrato met this by saying that if the immediate delivery of the city were refused, the greatest embroilment in political and ecclesiastical relations would ensue.¹

The Emperor even brought himself to despatch his court official, Figueroa, to Ottavio Farnese and the Pope with messages of condolence² and a denial of all complicity in the deeds committed in Piacenza. On his return from a hunting party on the 2nd of October he received both the Cardinal-Legate and Ottavio's representative, Count Sforza Pallavicini. The Legate, who was given audience first, remarked that although he had not yet received from the Pope any instruction with regard to his attitude towards the events at Piacenza, he could not refrain from saying that the occasion was of the utmost importance and one on which it was imperative that his Majesty should declare his mind. He made no concealment that no credence could be given to Ferrante's plea of justification, and once more urged the immediate restoration of Piacenza to Ottavio Farnese. Charles attempted to defend Gonzaga, and declared that his own affection for Ottavio was that of a father for his son; but he was of opinion that the Duke could not ask more from him than he was receiving from the Pope; the behaviour of Paul III. could not conduce to benefits towards Ottavio.

¹ Sfondrato's letter of Sept. 21, 1547, in PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 5, n. 5, and partly in the *Nuntiatürberichte*, X., 120 *seqq.*

² *Cf.* *Nuntiatürberichte*, X., 126, 142. The letter of credence from Charles V. here printed, of Sept. 25, 1547, was already published in *Spicil. Vatic.*, I., 76.

Here the Legate thought that he must interpose with the observation that the Emperor had made similar remarks on various occasions; he therefore could not avoid reminding his Majesty that the Pope not only on repeated occasions had refrained from courses injurious to the Imperial interests, but had expended a substantial portion of his income on services rendered to Charles, and that to those very contributions the victory in Germany was for the most part owing.

As the Emperor made no answer to these outspoken utterances, the Cardinal went on to describe the trouble which would arise everywhere, especially in the affairs of the Council, if on the question of Piacenza a miscarriage of justice were to be allowed. Charles replied that private concerns ought never to exercise an influence on public affairs, whereupon the Cardinal remarked that such influence was sure to be exercised when its source was, in both cases, the same, namely, mutual confidence or mutual distrust. The Emperor now tried to bring the interview to an end by assuring Sfondrato that his dutiful reverence and obedience towards the Holy See would never fail; in the Diet now begun he would do everything that was possible on behalf of the cause of religion and inform the Pope and the Legates on all points; as regarded Piacenza he had come to no decision, but he would not fail to take the measures proper to the occasion. To this concise and general statement the Legate replied: "Since your Majesty has not yet come to any decision on this subject, I beg permission to request that the decision may be come to in such a way that it may be not only salutary but swift."¹

Immediately after the Legate, Sforza Pallavicini had an

¹ See Sfondrato's letter of Oct. 2, 1547, in the *Nuntiaturberichte* X., 131 *seq.*

audience. Yet even he received the same colourless answers, but with this difference, that the Emperor remarked at the close that he did not wish misunderstandings to arise between him and the Pope over Piacenza, and that he would show his favour towards Ottavio Farnese. The spark of hope which this expression had kindled in the Legate and Pallavicini was very soon extinguished in both by a declaration made by Granvelle.¹

The same devices which had been employed at Augsburg were also employed at Rome by Mendoza towards the Pope and Cardinal Farnese with the same unsuccessful results.² What else could have been expected when it was already known at the Papal court on the 17th of September that Ferrante Gonzaga had threatened Count Santaflora and Sforza Pallavicini with the Emperor's displeasure if they continued to protect Parma?³

Even if the Imperialists subsequently abstained from

¹ See Sforza Pallavicini's letter of Oct. 3, 1547, *ibid.*, 134, n. 1; here (137, n. 4) also in an Italian translation is Granvelle's Spanish document handed to the Legates and already cited by Pallavicini (l. 10, c. 5, n. 10).

² Cf. Mendoza's reports in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 119 *seq.*, 121, 126. For Diego Hurtado de Mendoza as statesman, humanist, and poet, see GRAUX, Orig. du fonds grec de l'Escorial, Paris, 1880, 163 *seq.*; FESENMAIER, Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (Progr.), Munich, 1881-1882, 1883-1884; Histor. Zeitschr., XXXIX., 404 *seq.*; HAVE-MANN, Darstellungen aus der Gesch. Spaniens, Göttingen, 1850, 311; Nuntiatürberichte, X., xv *seq.*; EHSES in Histor. Jahrb., XXIX., 677. The extracts from Mendoza's letters made by the partisan writer AYMÓN (Maximes politiques du Pape Paul III., La Haye, 1716), from a codex in the Library of the Escorial, are so fragmentary and arranged with such a polemical intention that they are of no use for historical purposes.

³ See B. Ruggieri's report of Sept. 17, 1547 (copy in BALAN is inaccurate, VI., 396), now authentically reproduced in Nuntiatürberichte, X., 522, n. 1.

vexing Parma, they yet took no steps to punish the murderers of Pier Luigi and to surrender Piacenza as Paul III. demanded.¹ The crime of the 10th of September was to be turned to the fullest account. The surrender of Piacenza on the guarantee of compensation was held out as an enticement by the Imperialists to bend the Pope to submission to their master's policy. Paul III. saw through the scheme, and now at last made plain his unmistakable disinclination to give way on the question of the Council.²

The Pope's inordinate love for his own offspring may have given the Imperialists some hope that the agitation and horror caused by the recent occurrences would put an end to a life now numbering eighty years; but the iron disposition of Paul III. was proof even against such a shock as this,³ and henceforward his conduct gained in dignity. "In his relation to the Emperor he appears as the one who has received injury, and the sympathies of men are turned to him and withdrawn from the cold statecraft of his adversary."⁴

Next to the Pope, Cardinal Farnese was the most cruelly stricken. In his first moment of excitement he exclaimed: "If Piacenza is not given back, then will I help myself, as best I can, even if I have to summon hell to aid me."

¹ See the brief of Sept. 20, 1547, in RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 110, and Nuntiaturberichte, X., 116, n. 1, where there is fuller information about Mignanelli's mission; see also Spicil. Vat., I., 75 *seq.*; FONTANA, II., 502 *seq.*

² Already on Sept. 26, 1547, Mendoza had reported that the Pope had spoken of ordering a session to be held in Bologna (see DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 123).

³ He told the Venetian ambassador that he hoped to outlive the Emperor (see DE LEVA, IV., 377, n. 1).

⁴ FRIEDENSBURG in Nuntiaturberichte, X., xxxviii; *cf.* CAMPANA, 407.

Later he threatened to deliver over Parma to the French.¹ Such utterances were intended to alarm the Imperialists, but at bottom Farnese hoped against hope that the Emperor would have the sense to give back his booty under certain precautionary measures and place Ottavio, his son-in-law, once more in possession of Piacenza. Mendoza tried to foster these vain hopes by showing a letter from Granvelle. Even after the disappointment caused by Figueroa's silence on the restoration of Piacenza, Farnese was of opinion that the Emperor, in view of the ferment in Germany and Italy and the threatening attitude of France, would not push things to extremities.²

The Pope also did not yet wish to bar a way of return to the Emperor. When Paul III. in the middle of October addressed a consistory on the murder of Pier Luigi, he declared that Ferrante Gonzaga was certainly the murderer, but he hoped that the crime had been committed unknown to Charles V. and that his Majesty would restore Piacenza to the Church, with which object Mignanelli had been sent to Augsburg. He cherished a distinct hope that the Emperor would fulfil this just expectation and not make himself a participator in wrongdoing. Even if, the Pope went on to declare, he were willing to forgive the injuries he had suffered as a man, leaving it to God to inflict punishment on the sinner, he could not tolerate and forget the acts of iniquity and robbery perpetrated against the Papacy and the Church, but must visit them with chastisement even if in doing so he should die a martyr's death.³

¹ See Mendoza's report in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 124, 129.

² Cf. DE LEVA, IV., 374 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 142 *seq.*

³ Of the consistory, which is not mentioned in the *Acta Consist. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), nothing was known except from the extract given by RIBIER (II., 61), from a despatch of the French

In reality Paul III. believed that since the murder of September the 10th everything was to be feared from the Imperialists.¹ The fate of Clement VII., in which he had shared, rose before his eyes in vivid colours; after losing Piacenza, he observed, he had no wish to lose Rome also.² Measures of security were ordered to be taken without delay. While in Rome troops were collected together under pretext of danger from the side of the Colonna, secret negotiations were entered into with the ambassadors of Venice and France.³ Henry II., on hearing the news of Pier Luigi's murder, had at once held out hopes of assistance to the Pope.⁴ Du Mortier, hitherto French ambassador in Rome, was recalled and replaced by François de Rohan.⁵ In the last week of October came also Charles de Guise, appointed Cardinal on the 27th of July, ostensibly to receive the red hat,⁶ but really in order

ambassador in Venice, with the obviously incorrect date, Sept. 17. We are indebted to Friedensburg for further information by his publication of Mendoza's Spanish report of Oct. 16 in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 579 *seq.*

¹ "Who," observes Bezold pertinently (p. 803), "could any longer feel safe in the presence of a power which could stoop to employ such means?"

² See Mendoza's letter of Sept. 20, 1547, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 570.

³ Cf. DÖLLINGER, I., 113, 116 *seq.*, 119 *seq.*, 121, 124, 126, 129; *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 570, 572, 574.

⁴ See Dandino's *letter to Cardinal Farnese, dat. Fontainebleau, 1547, Sept. 17 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ His instructions (without date) in RIBIER, II., 39 *seq.* The *Acta consist. cancell. give Oct. 6, 1547, as the date of the consistory in which Rohan was received to do homage for Henry II. (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican); see the *declaration of obedience in Var. Polit., 46, f. 157^b *seq.* (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ The hat was given at last on Oct. 24, 1547 (see Acta consist. cancell., Consistorial Archives of the Vatican).

to negotiate about an alliance by means of which Paul III. hoped to be backed up by France.¹

Guise, an ardent French partisan, once more set before the Pope in glowing colours the shamelessness of the Emperor's conduct: the murder of Pier Luigi by hired bravos, the forcible occupation of a city which Charles himself had bestowed on the Holy See in requital for the help given to him by Papal forces to conquer the Duchy of Milan, and finally, the refusal to restore it to the legitimate successor of the murdered prince and his own son-in-law, who had served him in the war with the happiest success. All the pent-up anger of the Pope, which in Mendoza's presence he had wisely curbed, now broke out afresh. All that he had done for the Emperor, especially by his participation in the Schmalkaldic war, he now rued bitterly. He could forgive his predecessors Leo X. and Clement VII. for the favours shown to them by Charles V., but not himself. From henceforth he was determined to renew in perpetuity the alliance with France which, as the course of history proved, had always been advantageous to the Holy See. He hoped that he might live long enough to see his friendship with the French King set upon a firm basis, his own family bound to him by indissoluble ties, and he himself an agent in raising Henry II. to be one of the most powerful princes in the world.²

The danger from the Emperor's side seemed so great to Paul III. that he forgot everything else. The warlike preparations which Charles V. was making in Germany and Italy caused alarm in Rome lest he should carry out the advice³

¹ For Guise's negotiations, see RIBIER, II., 71 *seq.*; DE LEVA, IV., 376; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 168, n 1.

² See Guise's report of Oct. 31, 1547, in RIBIER, II, 74, 75.

³ For the period of Clement VII., see our statements in Vol. IX. of this work, 453 *seqq.* During that of Paul III., Charles's chief

so often given him by his statesmen and the enemies of the Farnesi and invade the Papal States, already wedged in on the north and south, and confine the Pope within the limits of his ecclesiastical office. Rumours were already afloat of an armed expedition against Rome like that led in 1527 by Frundsberg and Bourbon.¹ No proof was forthcoming that Charles had formed any such plan, but, on the other hand, it is certain that Ferrante Gonzaga, in anticipation of a conjunction between France and the Pope, had made proposals of a similar kind. Gonzaga himself wished to seize Parma, Cosimo de' Medici, with the help of Rodolfo Baglioni, was to operate against Perugia, while Ascanio Colonna attacked Rome on the south.²

Against such a danger Paul III. thought of securing himself by a defensive alliance with France, Venice, Urbino, and Switzerland. This combination was to form "the door for offensive operations,"³ and to free Italy from the Spanish yoke.⁴ The Pope in his alarm looked on all sides for support: he even appealed to his mortal enemy Cosimo de' Medici,⁵ and naturally appealed in vain. Far-reaching schemes were concocted. In Italy, Milan, Genoa,

counsellors were Cardinal Accolti (*ca.* 1542; see DESJARDINS, III., 25 *seq.*), Mendoza, 1543 (DE LEVA, IV., 479, n. 4), and Burlamachi (see *ibid.*, 234, n. 3; CANTÙ, Eretici, II., 476).

¹ Cf. HENNE, VIII., 315; BROSCHE in the Mitteil. des österr. Instituts, XXIII., 144. For Charles V.'s ascendancy in Italy, see FIEDLER, Relationen, 58 *seq.*, 65 *seq.*

² See Gonzaga's letters of Nov. 4 and 7, 1547, in MAURENBRECHER, 164.

³ Cf. RIBIER, II., 75 *seq.*, 81; BROSCHE, *loc. cit.* For the slender relationships between Paul III. and the Swiss, see Archiv für schweiz. Gesch., XIII., 272 *seq.*, and WIRZ, Filonardi, 98 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. CAMPANA, 417.

⁵ See LUPO GENTILE, 121.

and Naples were to be wrested from the Emperor; for the undertaking against Naples the assistance of the numerous refugees was counted upon before all else, and even the services of the ruler of Algiers and of the Sultan were taken into calculation.¹

With regard to Genoa, Spinola negotiated with Cardinals du Bellay and Guise; Giulio Cibò, who had been already implicated in the Fiesco conspiracy, came at this time to Rome.² As the secret of both plots was divulged, it may well be surmised that they were only intended to intimidate the Emperor.³ Besides, the Pope, despite his great indignation, was far from intending to fling himself there and then into the arms of the French King. Only when Venice also entered into the compact would Paul III. bind himself to the league with France.⁴ Henry II., on his side, had many considerations to bring forward against the draft of the Franco-Papal treaty, which Cardinal Guise had transmitted to him on the 10th of November 1547.⁵ On neither side was a conclusion arrived at; for the time being everything was in suspense.

In the meantime Charles V., surrounded by Spanish and Italian troops, had opened at Augsburg on the 1st of September 1547 the Diet to which the epithet "armed" was given. All the seven Electors and almost all the temporal and ecclesiastical princes were present, and the

¹ See RIBIER, II., 81; DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 81; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 571, 575. In the beginning of 1548 Paul III. even put out diplomatic approaches to the Sultan; but nothing more is known (see BROSCH, *loc. cit.*, 146 *seq.*).

² See DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 73, 74; *cf.* Atti d. Soc. Ligur., VIII., Docum., 136; F. MUSETTINI, Ricciarda Malaspina e Giulio Cibò, Modena, 1864; DE LEVA, IV., 379 *seq.*

³ DE LEVA, IV., 382.

⁴ *Cf.* CAMPANA, 411.

⁵ See DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 80, 84 *seq.*, 86.

Venetian envoy observed with astonishment the "unbounded reverence" displayed towards the Emperor.¹

To those who looked only on the surface, Charles certainly appeared to stand on the pinnacle of his authority, but he did not fail to perceive that a complete subjection of the Protestant Estates as a whole was out of the question. The northern portions of the Empire were as good as untouched by the events which had just come to pass; but in the rest of Germany also the situation seemed so difficult that the Emperor felt that he had not the means in his possession to carry out his wishes by force.² The circumstance that the Emperor had already been confronted by a confederation of numerous Protestant Estates was charged with weighty consequences.

In securing the neutrality of Duke Maurice of Saxony, concessions, on matters of religion, contrary to the stipulations of the treaty concluded with the Pope, had been made which flung over the authority of the Tridentine Council. In renewed violation of the above-mentioned agreement, Charles, in his treaties with the conquered Estates, had not made recognition of the Council one of his conditions, but only submission to the ordinances of the Diet. To the Estates he had given the express

¹ FIEDLER, *Relationen*, 146.

² WOLF, *Interim*, 44. As to the possibility of restoring the Church throughout the Empire by force, contemporary opinion was already divided. Among modern historians also the most opposite views are still held on this point. K. A. MENZEL (*III.*, 282) is of opinion that forcible measures on behalf of the ancient Church would, humanly speaking, have brought about the same results in Germany that Ferdinand I. had achieved in Bohemia and Austria. MAURENBRECHER (p. 175) goes further, but overlooks entirely the hindrances which lay in the dissatisfaction of Bavaria and in the separate treaties which Charles entered into with the Protestant States.

assurance that they would be permitted to continue in their religion as before, and that no compulsory change would be forced upon them.¹ If, therefore, there were expectations among many that the victor in the Schmalkaldic war would take vigorous measures for the restoration of the Catholic Church in Germany, the fact was overlooked that the victor himself had already barred the way to any decisive policy of this sort.

The situation was still further complicated by the quarrel with the Pope over the Council, in regard to which the Emperor remained stubborn in his autocratic demand that the Fathers at Bologna should return without delay to Trent. Paul III. was ready to accede to this if the Emperor would give him assurances of the submission of the Protestants of Germany to the decrees of the Synod. Amid the great difficulties with which he was confronted, Charles V., looking upon the Council as if it were an Imperial Diet, seems to have contemplated the possibility of a re-discussion and re-statement of the dogmatic decisions already registered.² He completely failed to see that this was beyond the power of any Pope to allow; in theological matters Charles was somewhat at sea, and was also strongly biassed by his political advisers, who from the religious point of view were to some extent in favour of very questionable opinions.

The critical nature of the situation explains the very moderate attitude taken by Charles at the beginning of the Diet of Augsburg. The proposition which he laid before the Estates on the 1st of September 1547 reaffirmed, "as if there had been neither war nor victory," in relation to ecclesiastical as well as secular affairs, the utterances of

¹ See *supra*, p. 327.

² Cf. RANKE, *Deutsche Geschichte*, V., 6th ed., 3, 5 *seq.*

previous Diets.¹ The affairs of religion were handled with striking brevity. Since the disruption in Germany, so ran the message, has been the root and chief cause of all the disturbance in the Empire, and without its removal no restoration of peace was possible and to attain this object the Council in Trent had been summoned, the first and principal subject of deliberation must be how to effect an agreement and, pending the success of such efforts, how to deal with questions of religion; it would be the business of the Estates to submit proposals on this subject.

No doubt could exist as to the object Charles V. had in view. He was as determined as ever to carry out his wishes in the matter of the Council, in spite of the Pope and the Fathers in Bologna. He was bent on exercising pressure on the latter to transfer the Synod once more to Trent through the initiative of the Diet, and in the case of this form of intimidation failing, to cover his retreat by an arbitrary interim regulation of religion carried by the unanimous vote of the Diet.² He had taken steps preparatory to such an interim in August, before the opening of the assembly.³ This finely devised plan was frustrated by the refusal of the ecclesiastical princes to give an expression of opinion before Charles had expounded his intentions more clearly. The secular Electors also of the Palatinate, Saxony and Brandenburg, while disclaiming any intention of anticipating his Majesty, begged, all the same, that a "general, free

¹ See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 675. As many of the Protestant princes objected to a "Papist" as President of the Diet, Charles V. conferred this position not on Cardinal Truchsess but on the Archduke Maximilian (see Venet. Depeschen., II., 336).

² WOLF, Interim, 48.

³ Referred to by FRIEDENSBURG in Archiv für Ref.-Gesch., IV., 213 *seq.*

Christian council should be held at Trent or elsewhere in Germany” for the removal of erroneous doctrines and abuses, to the decisions of which Paul III. must submit. At this “free” council all bishops would have to abjure their oath to the Pope, a decisive vote be given to the Protestants, and the decrees already formulated at Trent be “reassumed,” *i.e.* re-opened for discussion! Even the College of princes, prelates, and counts, in which there was a Catholic majority, demanded this “reassumption,” a proceeding in direct contradiction to the principles of the Church. The Estates of the Empire declared that the best way to remove the religious dissensions would be to summon a new religious conference or a national council in which God-fearing persons of all stations in life should have a voice in the decisions! Regarding the Council of Trent, the Estates expressed their conviction that the Emperor would not take any steps towards its continuance, since that Synod “prematurely, without impartial hearing of the cause, had drawn up a medley of confessions and anathemas of doctrine on the most important articles under dispute, and from it nothing was to be looked for but trouble and injustice.”¹

Opinions being thus divided, the Emperor interposed with a resolution of a very peculiar kind. In this document, dated the 18th of October,² he declared, with a strange ignoring of contrary opinions, that he understood from the answer of the Estates, “in which he graciously

¹ SASTROW, II., 142 *seq.*; *cf.* MENZEL, III., 225 *seq.*; WOLF, 49 *seq.*

² SASTROW, II., 151 *seq.*; BUCHOLTZ, VI., 203; BEUTEL, 22 *seq.* WOLF (p. 51) remarks: “The idea of the Emperor was this, to obtain from the Protestants a declaration that they were ready to attend a council in a German city and to execute its decrees. Thereupon Charles, with this important concession in his hand, would, as executor of the proposals of the Estates, demand the reassembly of the Council at Trent.” *Cf.* also PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 6, n. 4.

acquiesced, that the discussion on disputed points of religion by the General Christian Council appointed to be held and duly opened at Trent, should there be continued," and he "undertook that they would submit themselves to such a General Council and obediently await and accept its determinations for themselves and their successors, and thus in that place follow the footsteps of the Holy Fathers and ancients who in matters of religion had ever had recourse to holy councils of the Church." The Emperor went on to invite the co-operation of his subjects, especially those of the lower orders, to help as far as possible in supporting the Council in its continuance at Trent so that the deliberations might run their course the sooner and with greater dignity. He also called upon all Christian potentates and nationalities, and especially the German archbishops, bishops, and prelates, to be present personally or by representatives, giving also an assurance that the upholders of the Augsburg Confession might appear also, with safe-conducts there and back and the right to be heard if necessary. All the transactions and decrees of the Synod should be godly and Christian, all party spirit set aside, all discussions and decisions regulated by Holy Scripture and patristic teaching, and also a serviceable and Christian reform established in matters ecclesiastical and secular and all erroneous teaching and abuses duly abolished. The prayer of the Estates that means should be contrived whereby, until the General Council gave its decisions, they might live on good terms one with another, the Emperor was willing to consider.

Regardless of the objection of Sfrondato, the representative of the Pope, of whom not a single mention¹

¹ Sfrondato at once complained, when Granvelle on October 18 submitted to him the Imperial resolution, that the promise of the reassembly at Trent was arbitrary, and dwelt especially on the absence of any

had been made in the Emperor's document, the latter endeavoured to induce the Estates, by acceptance of this vague resolution, to entrust to him "the sole management of the affairs of the Council." He succeeded with the Electors and princes, although they only pledged themselves thereby to a council which was to be held at once. The representatives of the towns withstood stubbornly all the endeavours of the Emperor's counsellors. Called before Charles V., they declared that it was not their province to overrule and improve on the opinion of the princes. At the same time they presented a declaration, which had been prepared some time before, demanding a free general Christian council not subject to Papal authority or a national council. The Emperor conveyed to them in reply that it was most acceptable to him that, following the example set by the higher Estates, they placed themselves entirely in his hands and were of the same mind as the rest!

mention of the Pope and of the Holy See. In reply he was told that the latter had been intentional in order to obviate difficulties from the Protestant side, and that even with this omission the authority of the Holy See was safeguarded by the express condition "according to the teaching of Scripture and of the Fathers." When Sfondrato further called attention to the lack of any definite pledge with regard to the restitution of Church property, he was silenced by the assurance that that lay within the intention of the Emperor but that it was impossible to do everything at once. Sfondrato finally pointed out the difficulties that might arise from the expression that the Council was in the first instance to be held at Trent. Granvelle was of opinion that no further alteration could be made, as the matter was now fully settled (see Sfondrato's letter of 21st October 1547 in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 154 *seq.*; *cf.* Pallavicini, l. 10, c. 6, n. 4, who here cites another letter from Sfondrato of 17th November 1547, belonging to this period, but no longer forthcoming). In the words "according to the teaching of Scripture and of the Fathers," BUCHOLTZ (VI., 205) sees "the fundamental preservation of the Papal rights if they are understood in the sense given them by the Church." Yes, if!

In this way an entirely different meaning was given to the declaration of the towns, for in reality they were not in agreement with the higher Estates at all. They only did not like to animadvert openly on their opinions of the latter in the presence of the Emperor. In order that this ambiguous behaviour might not be used against them in the future, they had set forth their true sentiments in the declaration before mentioned to which afterwards under all circumstances they could appeal.¹

If the Emperor was satisfied with a "personal management" of the Council fenced about with provisions in this way, he was deceiving himself; for it was clear that the Protestants had never intended really to submit to the conciliar decrees, and that the towns made downright demands for a Council without the Pope, and such an one as should not be a continuation of the Synod of Trent.² In no case was he justified in allowing Cardinal Madruzzo to declare to the Pope that the Electors, the ecclesiastical and temporal princes, as well as the towns, had submitted

¹ Cf. HÄBERLIN, I., 263, who remarks correctly that in the case under discussion one party wanted to circumvent the other (see also BEUTEL, 24 *seq.*; WOLF, 52). One of the Nuremberg delegates at the Diet told Mocenigo in September that he did not understand how the Council could be general and free when the Pope granted a vote to prelates only and demanded from the Germans a recognition of the decrees hitherto passed in the Council without the concurrence of that nation (Venet. Depeschen., II., 340). Many towns did not agree with the negative attitude of their representatives. Thus the Council of Frankfort wrote on 3rd November 1547 to their envoy O. von Melem that they could not understand why their honourable city should repose so little confidence in the Emperor and thus act separately from the other Estates, and held strongly that since the Electors and princes had entrusted the matters of religion to the personal management of the Emperor, the towns should act in like manner (Reichstagsakten, LX., 44; State Archives, Frankfort).

² MAURENBRECHER'S opinion (Karl V., 176).

themselves unconditionally to the Council assigned to Trent and there opened, and that on these grounds the Fathers assembled at Bologna ought to return to the former place.¹ In order to give more force to a statement founded on an untruth the Emperor had already, without letting the Legates know, induced the German bishops, in a letter to the Pope, to describe in the most glowing colours the dangers and disadvantages arising to the Church from the translation of the Council to Bologna, and to demand the return of the Fathers of Bologna to Trent.²

Every means was to be used to browbeat the Pope into subjection to the Emperor's will. The despatch of the letter from the German episcopate, as well as Madruzzo's mission, was a continuation of the policy of terrorism which the murder of Pier Luigi had introduced.

Cardinal Madruzzo at a critical moment in the year 1546 had played the part of go-between for the Emperor with the Pope.³ At the same time it was difficult to understand how, on this occasion, he could allow himself to be made use of for services which were doomed beforehand to hopeless failure. The instructions given him were contrary to fact when they spoke of unconditional submission on the part of all the Estates to the Tridentine Council, and made this a reason that the Emperor should demand a speedy return of the Council to Trent, and that too under threats of a protest if the Pope were to refuse his consent.

Sfondrato was right in his immediate surmise that by

¹ See Madruzzo's instructions of Nov. 10, 1547, in *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 441 *seqq.*

² The letter dated Sept. 14, 1547, in RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 84 (*cf.* *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 119; *Venet. Depeschen*, II., 351 *seq.*).

³ *Cf. supra*, pp. 287, 290 *seq.*

the demand for a retranslation of the Council nothing else was intended than to put the Pope in the wrong in case of his refusal, and thereby to lead up to an independent course of action in religious affairs. The Legate, on hearing of Madruzzo's mission, insisted that the latter should also have the fullest instructions with regard to the incident of Piacenza. The Imperialists would not at first consent to this, and only with difficulty was permission obtained that Madruzzo might bring the matter up for general discussion in Rome.¹

Madruzzo left Augsburg on the 6th of November 1547. His instructions were sent after him a few days later by special courier. In this document the Emperor begged that, besides complying with his principal request, the reopening of the Council in Trent, the Pope would send officials with full powers to set in order temporarily the religious affairs of Germany; concerning the Papal election, the tranquillizing assurance was given that this, even during the assembly of the Council, would be vested in the Sacred College alone.²

On November the 23rd Madruzzo entered Rome, having been met by Mendoza, who had gone forward to accompany him and in accordance with the Emperor's wishes was to take part in the negotiations.³ Madruzzo alighted at the Vatican, and on the following day was received in private audience. He knew well how deeply offended Paul III. had been by the Emperor's behaviour in the matter of Piacenza, and therefore dealt first of all with this subject only, on which certainly he was not able to bring forward much of importance. In an audience in which Farnese and Mendoza took part, on the 25th of November, Madruzzo

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 178 *seqq.*, 190.

² See Nuntiaturberichte, X., 441 *seqq.*

³ See Charles V.'s letter of Nov. 10, 1547, in MAURENBRECHER, 124* *seqq.*

stated his case as regards the Council, and presented a copy of his instructions. Their phraseology deceived no one, and it was at once recognized that they only dealt with the submission of the Protestants to the first Council that should be held. Nevertheless, no hurried steps were taken; the Pope deferred his answer, as the opinion of the Cardinals had first to be taken.¹

Paul III. had already, on the 6th of November, called Cardinal Cervini to Rome.² Opinions were also asked from Sfondrato, del Monte, and the deputation of Cardinals for the Council. Sfondrato drew a vivid picture of the dangers, but dared not offer any advice. Cardinal del Monte was of opinion that the Emperor was trying to find a means of inculpating the Pope and Cardinals for waste of time, and of then assembling a Council himself. As the Tridentine Synod had removed its seat of its own accord to another place, it was not within the Emperor's competency to transfer it again at his fancy to another city without the approval of the Pope and the rest of the Christian princes. It was impossible, only to please the Protestants, because they demanded a Council in Trent, to do such a thing against the wish of the Fathers and against the wishes of a great number of Catholic princes. In addition Trent had at an earlier period been thought dangerous as a seat for the Council, and this was now still more the case since the events at Piacenza. From dislike of a suspension del Monte advised that the Council should carry out its work in Bologna. Still stronger, he thought, would the Pope's position be against the Emperor if the sittings were removed to Rome. The deputation of Cardinals, in consequence of the deaths of Sadoletto and

¹ Cf. Farnese's letter in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 211, 212, 214 n.

² Cervini left Bologna on Nov. 10 (see Massarelli, *Diarium*, IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 717 *seqq.*).

Badia and the absence of Sfondrato and Morone, now consisted only of Guidiccioni, Crescenzi, and Pole, and were at first unable to agree. The strict Guidiccioni was in favour of the continuance of the Council in Bologna, while his two colleagues preferred a suspension. At last they drew up together a memorial recommending, with regard to the despatch of a plenipotentiary to the Pope, that the opinion of the Fathers at Bologna should be taken on the question of the Council and afterwards a final decision given.¹

The Pope approved of this compromise. On the 9th of December 1547 he let Madruzzo be informed of it in consistory, but at his request no resolution was come to until Mendoza had been heard. The latter allowed it to transpire that he would deliver a protest against the continuance of the Council in Bologna. In reality, however, he confined himself to a demand made in consistory on the 14th of December, in forcible but very courteous tones, that the Synod should forthwith without delay return to Trent. He was informed that in the next consistory a reply would be communicated to him. After Mendoza and the other envoys had left the consistory it was decided that the matter should be laid before the Fathers of Bologna, which was done in a brief of the 16th of December.² Madruzzo now despaired of any success for his mission, and avoided the conflict between his

¹ Cf. PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 6-8; LE PLAT, III., 662 *seq.*; BEUTEL, 31 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 212, n. 2. The memorial also insisted that Charles V. had obtained from the Protestants a promise of submission only to a Council to be held (*celebrando*) at Trent.

² See Farnese's letter in the Nuntiaturberichte, X., 212, 213; cf. RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 90; here (n. 91) is also the brief of Dec. 16, which, according to Massarelli (Diarium IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 727), reached Bologna two days later (see also PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 8).

position as Cardinal and that as representative of the Emperor by a hurried departure from Rome.¹

In consequence the answer of the Council, to which Paul III. had left the decision, bearing date of the 20th of December, was presented to Mendoza in consistory on the 27th of the same month. In this document, drawn up in accordance with del Monte's proposals, the Fathers at Bologna expressed their readiness to return to Trent if this could be done without general prejudice to the interests of Christendom. As a preliminary step to this it would first be necessary for those who had remained behind in disobedience in Trent to attend the legitimately constituted Council as a mark of their recognition, as was due, otherwise an evil precedent would be created. In the second place, since the submission of the German nation was promised only to a Council which was still to be held in Trent, it must previously be established beyond possibility of mistake that the decrees on doctrine hitherto published in accordance with Catholic teaching shall be recognized

¹ He reached Trent by Dec. 23; he was expected at Augsburg on the Epiphany (see Sfondrato's letter in the *Nuntiatgeberichte*, X., 220). The Bishop of Fano, P. Bertano, *wrote on Dec. 15, 1547, from Rome to the Duke of Camerino: "Parte questa mattina il s. Cardinale di Trento malissimo sodisfatto et in grandissima rotta con costoro" (State Archives, Florence, Urb., 125, f. 204); *ibid.*, 108, f. 703, a *letter of the Duke of Urbino to his mother, dat. Pesaro, Dec. 21, 1547, on Madruzzo's visit (hierì et questa notte): "Dice che se ne torna con la guerra in pugno et che gli duole la ruvina d' Italia, la quale ha protestato et protesta per tutto et che senza dubbio fra quattro mesi al più lungo saranno in Italia cento mila fanti et venta mila cavalli Thodeschi, i quali non potevano avere la miglior nova di questa et che ogni cosa andarà a ferro e a fuoco, di che Dio per sua bontà tolga loro el potere in tutto et per tutto. Dice che la lega fra el papa e il re di Francia è al credere suo gia conclusa et che in ogni caso crede, che non vi sia più disegno di accordo; parte tanto mal satisfatto in ogni cosa, che non si potria aggiongervi."

as immutable and not under any pretext whatever liable to fresh examination. In the third place, since a Council has been spoken of consisting of members drawn from *all* conditions of men, an assurance must be given that no new form of conciliar discussion is intended. Not less necessary is it, in the fourth place, that on the return of the Council to Trent both the whole assembly in general and each individual member thereof in particular shall have perfect freedom to remain at or to depart from that place. Fifthly and finally, the right of the majority of the Fathers to decide upon the translation and termination of the Council must be recognized.¹

The conditions laid down by the Council touched the core of the matter and made the situation clear. Even the Emperor could not fail to see that the "personal management" of conciliar affairs did not signify that unconditional submission to the Tridentine Council, so successfully begun, which he had ordered Madruzzo to offer; on the contrary, no one knew better than he that the Protestants had only been driven by the superiority of his armed power to consent to the "personal management" of this matter, and that under the general term of a free Christian Council the Protestants meant nothing else than what they had always declared before. In the same way he must also have been well aware that they had not the slightest intention of recog-

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 94, 95; *cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium IV.*, ed. MERKLE, IV., 727 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 9, 10. By a brief of Jan. 1, 1548, the ecclesiastical Estates of the Empire were also at last given an answer to their representations of Sept. 14, 1547 (see RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 4-5; *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 226 n. 1). Farnese again impressed strongly on Sfondrato on Jan. 10, 1548, that there must be no room left for doubt that, unless the conditions, formulated by the Council and acknowledged by Charles himself to be justified, were carried out, there could be no further question of the return of the Synod to Trent (*Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 226 *seq.*).

nizing the conciliar decrees already published on the Holy Scriptures, original sin, justification, and the Sacraments, whence it was that in their declarations they always spoke of a council to be held at Trent but not of the Council which had been in session there already. The removal of all these dangerous ambiguities was the more unpleasant to the Emperor since thereby the whole artificial fabric of his "personal management" of the Council by means of all Estates of the Empire fell tumbling to the ground; but on this his demand for the retranslation of the Synod to Trent had been based; since, moreover, the answer of the Council made it clear that, in the case of their suspicions not being removed within a suitable lapse of time, they would proceed with their deliberations, Charles V. felt that he must no longer delay the adoption of counter-measures. The dread of a schism would deter Pope and Council from proceedings such as would, he feared, prove the destruction of all his plans.¹

Not for a moment did Charles accept the first of the conditions laid down by the Fathers at Bologna: that the Spanish prelates who had stayed behind in Trent must again unite with those in Bologna before the Council transferred its seat.² In everything must the Pope and Council bend before his will. The protestation, that appeal to terror, which hitherto he had only used as a threat, he now brought into immediate execution.³ For this purpose he chose the most solemn form which he could find. Two of his officials, the attorney, Francesco Vargas, and the doctor of canon law, Velasco, who since the beginning of November 1547 had secretly held themselves in readiness in Bologna

¹ See PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 11.

² This first condition, in BUCHOLTZ'S opinion (VI., 210), might have been complied with undoubtedly by the Emperor.

³ Cf. Venet. Depeschen, II., 379 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 627.

for any emergency, appeared on the 16th of January 1548 in the general congregation of the Council, then engaged in discussing abuses of the Sacrament of penance, and demanded a hearing.¹ This was granted, as was also the attendance of the notary and witnesses of the two Imperial procurators. In the plenary instructions which were shown to the notary of the Council it said that the Emperor, in the service of religion and in the interests of the Church, found himself under the necessity of protesting against certain persons who usurped the title of Apostolic Legates and against a convention in Bologna styling itself a Council. The Council met this attack by a declaration read aloud by the notary Claudio della Casa and repeated later on. In this counter-protestation the Council affirmed: Although the congregation sitting under the presidency of the Cardinal-Legate del Monte was under no obligation to hear procurators who had been sent to the Council as to an illegal convention, yet they would grant a hearing in order that it might not be said that it was not open to every man to present his case; against all consequences of this permission granted to the procurators the Council would protect itself. By this declaration the audience of the Emperor's agents "was reduced to an almost insignificant act of courtesy and etiquette due to the Imperial Majesty."²

Vargas in a distinct and audible voice then delivered an address in which, with avoidance of the prescribed titles

¹ The text of the Bolognese protest of the Emperor in RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 6 *seq.*; *cf.* Massarelli, *Diarium* IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 736; the letters addressed to Farnese by the Cardinal-Legate del Monte and the Archbishop Giov. Michele of Acerenza-Matera of Jan. 17, 1548, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 451 *seq.*, 453 *seq.*; see also PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 11.

² See BEUTEL, *Interim*, 37.

of the conciliar Fathers, he admonished the assembled bishops to take heed to that which he was about to announce in exact conformity with his Majesty's orders, and by their return to Trent to escape the inevitable ruin. As Vargas had begun with the words, "We are here as legally appointed plenipotentiaries of our Lord the Roman Emperor," so del Monte opened his reply by saying: "I also am here as Legate of the true and undoubted Pope Paul, the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of our Lord and Redeemer Jesus Christ. Here also are the Fathers of the General Council legally translated from Trent. We all beg the Emperor to change his mind, for on the troublers of a General Assembly of the Church, whatever position they may occupy, fall the heaviest penalties. Come what may, we shall not surrender the dignity of the Church and of the Council."

Vargas hereupon presented the original Imperial mandate, dated Augsburg, August the 22nd, 1547, in protest to the secretary of the Council, Angelo Massarelli, who read the document aloud, whereat the promotor of the Council, Ercole Severoli, and Cardinal del Monte repeated their protest already mentioned. Vargas then recited the Emperor's long-winded protest. The incidents of an earlier date were enumerated in a very one-sided manner; the translation to Bologna was attacked as having taken place illegally at the instigation of a few prelates without leave being asked of Pope, Emperor, or princes, and the return to Trent demanded, the latter on the false ground that all Estates of the Empire had promised unconditional submission to the Council summoned to Trent. The answer made by the Fathers of Bologna to the Pope was described as ambiguous and treacherous and the right of their assembly to prescribe laws for Christian people on matters of faith and of reform disputed: still, most of the

bishops present in Bologna were dependent upon the Pope's nod. This document, the tone of which towards the close increased in harshness, wound up with the significant declaration: "We declare aloud that our Emperor is ready to encounter the storm and tempest which he has feared and which he sees are about to break through your guilt and negligence and that of the Pope. The Church he will take zealously under his protection and do all he can that befits his right and office, his dignity and duty as Emperor and King, so far as the law permits and it has been established and observed by the laws, the doctrine of the Fathers, and the general consent of men."

Foreseeing that the Imperial procurators would not appear again to receive a written answer to their protest, the President of the Council, Cardinal-Legate del Monte, determined to reply at once. The violent attacks of the Emperor had exasperated even him, yet his rejoinder, although severe, was dignified. He solemnly called God to witness that all the allegations of the procurators against the honour of himself and of his colleagues and against the validity and legality of the translation were untrue, wherefore he refrained from producing the authentic proofs. He as well as his colleagues were true and legitimate Legates of the Holy See. The Emperor was the son, and not the lord and master of the Church. He as well as the Fathers of the Synod would rather suffer death than allow the temporal power to oppress the Church and rob her of her freedom.

The agitating proceedings which the Imperial procurators had brought about in this theatrical manner lasted from a quarter past two to a quarter past eight in the evening. The unruffled composure and firmness displayed by Cardinal del Monte on this occasion received the highest

tribute of recognition even from his enemies.¹ The same determination, however, was not shown by the majority of the Fathers. They inferred that the Emperor had been ill-informed because no mention had been made of the conditions on which the return to Trent depended.² The written reply therefore finally took the form of a very mild protest. When it was taken for delivery to the procurators they had already left.³ Morone expressed his horror at the consequences which a breach between the Emperor and Pope must entail. Yet he had confidence that the Emperor was too wise and too high-minded to conjure up a strife the end of which no man could foresee.⁴ Cardinal Cervini, who had returned to Bologna on the 23rd of January 1548, spoke in favour of a suspension, as Morone did on the 26th of January. In agreement with him was del Monte, who considered suspension to be the lesser evil. At the same time they sent proposals as to the answer to be made to the protest which Mendoza had lodged at Rome.⁵

In vain did well-intentioned Cardinals in Rome try to prevent a repetition of the scene enacted in Bologna; in vain the Pope attempted to put off Mendoza's audience, but the latter would not draw back. On the 23rd of January 1548, in a consistory before the Pope, Cardinals, and envoys, he declared ecclesiastical war in terms similar to those of the protest made at Bologna, subject to some necessary alterations. Notwithstanding all the accusa-

¹ See BEUTEL, Interim, 38.

² See in Appendix No. 35 Morone's letter of Jan. 23, 1548 (Viceroyal Archives, Innsbruck).

³ See PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 11.

⁴ See in Appendix No. 35 Morone's letter as above (Viceroyal Archives, Innsbruck).

⁵ See letter from the conciliar Legates to Cardinal Farnese in Nuntiaturberichte, X., 455 *seq.*

tions here raised against him, the sagacious Pope had sufficient self-mastery to abstain from an immediate reply. He wished to give an answer which should be the outcome of mature consideration, and invited Mendoza to attend a consistory on the 1st of February to receive his message.¹

In the meantime, the proposals of the Legates at Bologna arrived. They advised, together with the suspension of the Council, the assumption by the Pope of the function of judge in the matter of the removal to Trent.² In private consultation with Mendoza the proposal was also made that, instead of the transference of the Council, three Cardinal-Legates should be sent to Germany to arrange a temporary settlement of religious affairs. The Emperor's ambassador, in an audience of the Pope on the 25th of January, in which he made most violent reproaches, rejected this plan with the remark, "The Council first, the Legates afterwards."³

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 18 *seq.*; Nuntiatürberichte, X., 242, n. 1; here (p. 628 *seq.*) additions to Mendoza's letter of Feb. 2, only incompletely given by DÖLLINGER in Beiträge, I., 134 *seqq.* See also Vincenzo Parenzi's **letter, dat. Rome, Jan. 23, 1548 (State Archives, Lucca); D. Lasso's report of Jan. 28, 1548, in DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 91 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 12; *cf.* also BROMATO, II., 140 *seq.*, and especially CAMPANA, 432. The Imperial protest was at once circulated in print: Allegatione o vero Pro || testa fatta per l' illustriss. S. Don Diego || di Mendoza, Ambasciatore della Cesa || rea Maesta alla S. di N. S. Pap||a Paulo III. sopra le cose || appartenente al Concilio || generale di Trento. With the Imperial privilege, "impresso in Milano per Messer Gotardo da Ponte che sta appresso la Doana ne 1548 adi 3 Marzo," 10 sheets in small 4°.

² The letter of the conciliar Legates to Cardinal Farnese of Jan. 26, 1548, with the proposals as to the reply to be made to Mendoza's protest, in the Nuntiatürberichte, X., 455 *seq.*, 459; *cf.* Massarelli, Diarium IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 740.

³ See Mendoza's letter of Feb. 2, 1548, cited *supra*, note 1.

The answer given to Mendoza in consistory on the 1st of February 1548 to the protest of the 23rd of January was drawn up by Cardinal Pole with the utmost caution, tact, and wisdom, in order to avoid, as far as possible, the ultimate evil, a full and open rupture.¹ With this object, the offensive protestation was treated as an act of Mendoza's in which he had exceeded his master's instructions. Accordingly, the responsibility for the document was laid upon the ambassador, but even this in part in a very mitigated form. The latter, the reply began, could have no difficulty in forming an idea of the great grief felt by the Pope on receiving the protestation, as Mendoza himself apparently was not altogether a stranger to the same sentiments. The Pope, besides, could not believe that the Emperor intended to protest against the Pontiff's own person; his protest was lodged against the Legates as the authors of the transference of the Council. If it was said of the Fathers at Bologna that they were under special obligations to the Pope, his Holiness could only say that, apart from the relations in which he stood as Chief Shepherd towards his flock, he acknowledged no particular party, nor had he, during the negotiations hitherto carried on, yet found the necessity of having any such party to rely upon; on the contrary, he had urged upon the Legates as an express duty the maintenance of the freedom of the Council. As regards the complaint made of the answer sent in compliance with Madruzzo's proposal, the only rejoinder possible, until these general objections were more particularized, was that the strictest endeavour was made to adhere to the primitive usage of the Church, and also to the ordinances of the Emperor himself, provided the

¹ See RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 29 *seq.*; QUIRINI, Ep. Poli, IV., 382 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 244; PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 13; BEUTEL, 39 *seq.*; CAMPANA, 432 *seq.*

following premisses were observed, that the dogmas already established could not be submitted to further examination, that private persons could not be accepted as judges, and that freedom of place and persons should be guaranteed.

The answer then went on to make an important concession whereby Paul III. abandoned his previous standpoint that the Council at Bologna should decide on the matter of translation. Since in the protestation many reasons had been adduced to prove the invalidity and illegality of the transfer of the Council, reasons which equitably demanded examination, the Pope, out of love of unity in the Church, consented to arbitrate on this question. For this purpose four Cardinals from different nations, namely, du Bellay, Alvarez de Toledo, Crescenzi, and Pole, would have full powers to make inquiry into the legality of translation; if their verdict was adverse, then the Pope would bring all his authority into play in order to bring about the return to Trent. In order that in the interval Germany might not suffer any disadvantage, his Holiness offered to send Legates or nuncios thither who should, for the time being, try to meet the most pressing necessities.

This temperate as well as dignified reply of Paul III. shows plainly he wished to keep a way of escape open to Charles V. As an alliance with France and Venice was not to be reckoned upon as a certainty, it seemed necessary to temporize, however bitter the Pope's feelings were, especially at the behaviour of Charles in the affairs of Piacenza.¹

¹ See FRIEDENSBURG in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., xliii; *cf.* WOLF, *Interim*, 74; CAMPANA, 423 *seq.* "Hora ciascuno sta in dubbio," *writes V. Parenzi on Feb. 3, 1548, from Rome, "di quello sia per seguire. Poco bene si spera, ma si tiene che l' arme non s' habbino da pigliar si presto." Another *letter from the same of Feb. 5, 1548, is very pessimistic in tone: "D. Diegho partirà presto per Siena et

The endeavours to come to an understanding with Mendoza were fruitless, and he left Rome on the 15th of February.¹ It was of greater importance that Paul III., in accordance with the opinion of the Cardinal-Legates, resolved, in order to prevent a schism, to order a suspension of the Council so that all synodal transactions hitherto carried on in the congregations came to an end.² At the same time the preliminaries to a decision on the validity of the transfer of the Council were set on foot. On the 16th of February the Fathers at Bologna, and on the 25th those at Trent, were each directed to send at least three from their number in order that the Pope might give his decision after hearing the arguments on both sides.³

The Emperor in a Privy Council held on February the 13th, 1548, had confirmed Mendoza's protest. To the Pope's conciliatory and temperate reply of the 1st of February he ordered an answer to be prepared.⁴ Nevertheless, he still shrank from the extreme step. For the present he was satisfied with the success of his policy of threats.⁵ The point of capital importance was that the Pope did not reject absolutely the scheme of organizing religious conditions in Germany on a temporary basis. On this object the Emperor's whole mind was bent.

si crede, avanti che parta, farà qualch' altro atto forse più di mala sorte che la protesta" (State Archives, Lucca).

¹ PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 14; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 265, n. 4; DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 100. See also V. Parenzi's **report, dat. Rome, Feb. 18, 1548 (State Archives, Lucca).

² See KNÖPFLER in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlex., XI., 2d. ed., 2072.

³ See PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 14; Massarelli, Diarium IV., of Feb. 25, 1548, ed. MERKLE, I., 746.

⁴ See Sfondrato's report of Feb. 18, 1548, in the Nuntiaturberichte, X., 253.

⁵ See *ibid.*, xliii; BEUTEL, 40; WOLF, 74.

CHAPTER XI.

THE INTERIM.—LAST DAYS OF PAUL III.—HIS DEATH.

CARDINAL MADRUZZO had reported to the Diet of Augsburg on the 14th of January 1548 the unsuccessful results of his negotiations in Rome. In conjunction with this the Emperor brought forward his long-cherished plan¹ of establishing, in virtue of his supreme authority in the Empire, with the co-operation of the Estates, a readjustment of ecclesiastical conditions in Germany which, pending the full reconciliation hoped for from the Council, and as a preparation for the same, should prove satisfactory to Protestants and Catholics alike.²

The idea of such an agreement finds its earliest expression incidentally in a letter of Charles V. of the 9th of

¹ A German version of Madruzzo's narrative and the Emperor's report in SASTROW, II., 179 *seq.*, 198 *seq.*; *cf.* also Nuntiaturberichte, X., 232, n. 1.

² The view specially upheld by RANKE (*Deutsche Gesch.*, V., 6th ed., 32) and JANSSEN-PASTOR (III., 18th ed., 679 *seq.*), that Charles V. originally intended the Interim to be a general law of the Empire and not an exceptional measure binding on Protestants only, was first attacked by Maurenbrecher and afterwards by Beutel, Druffel, and others, but not on valid grounds (see WOLF, 84 *seq.*, and also POSTINA, 96). While there is written contemporary evidence in favour of the opposite view, the Carmelite, Westhof, in his unpublished treatise on the *Interreligio Imperialis* of 1549, made use of by Janssen, says expressly that the Emperor wished, even if it were only for a time, to be the religious dictator for the Catholics.

January 1547, in which he asked his brother Ferdinand I. to give him advice concerning the measures to be employed in Germany. In his reply of the 19th of February the King of the Romans took up his brother's suggestion, and recommended in the first place the usual method of a Council, to be constituted, however, in such a way as to leave no door open for Protestant complaint; since it was very doubtful, if the Pope continued to act as he had hitherto done, that this object would be obtained, although a great deal of time would be spent on the negotiations, but in order to avoid further secessions, a temporary reorganization of religion or Christian reformation, which afterwards could be confirmed by the Pope and Council,¹ must be established, on the basis of the earlier religious conferences, by theologians of mature experience. When Charles V. accepted this proposal he certainly was not thinking of founding a Germanic Church on the pattern of the Gallican. He only wished, by means of a religious compromise and the removal of abuses in the Church, to put an end to the internal dissensions which were crippling his Imperial authority.² In a certain sense Charles was falling back on the earlier attempts at reunion, but with this difference, that on this occasion the formula of agreement was not to be drawn up by a conference, and was to be of a temporary character.³ The Emperor still recognized as clearly as ever that the religious controversy turned upon two entirely contra-

¹ The important letters of the two Hapsburgs in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 403 *seq.*, 407 *seq.*

² This is rightly insisted upon by BEUTEL (p. 11), EGELHAAF (II., 505), and PAULUS in *Katholik*, 1894, II., 417 *seq.*

³ The affinity of the Interim with the earlier attempts at reunion is an argument that, as then, so now, the new formula of agreement was looked upon as binding on both parties.

dictory systems which could not be harmonized by a "more" or "less." Charles hoped that his new expedient would create a state of things by which the gradual return of the Protestants to the Catholic Church would be rendered possible.

Even if the Emperor's idea of restoring, in the flush of victory, the sorely needed religious peace to the Empire in such a way as this, sprang from the best intentions,¹ yet the whole undertaking was already from the outset foredoomed to failure from the lack of ecclesiastical authority. Charles had indeed declared in October 1547, when he appointed four theologians to discuss with his confessor Soto the management of religious affairs in Germany until the conciliar decision should have been pronounced, that the work of this commission was to be laid before the Pope,² but this step was not taken. Even the request made through Madruzzo and Mendoza that the Pope should co-operate through plenipotentiaries in the Emperor's scheme of religious reorganization in Germany was not meant quite seriously.³ The Pope certainly could not altogether be left out of the question, since through him only was it possible to get the German bishops to take a part in carrying out the "Provisorium"; but Paul III. was never permitted to exercise the decisive influence which as Head of the Church it was his prerogative to wield. The constant slights offered to Cardinal Sfondrato in the Diet, treatment of which he complains repeatedly in his

¹ In July 1547 the Venetian envoy was informed that the Emperor had declared that he felt himself bound by duty to Christ, to whom he owed his victory, to settle the religious troubles of Germany (Venet. Depeschen, II., 318).

² See Sfondrato's letter of Oct. 25, 1547, in Nuntiaturberichte, X., 163.

³ BEUTEL, 30.

letters,¹ above all, his total exclusion from any knowledge of the negotiations over the establishment of the Interim, show clearly that even a new plenipotentiary, to whose mission Paul III. was willing to consent, would have done no more than occupy a merely formal position.² The Cardinal-Legate, Sfondrato, it is true, at once expressed his astonishment when Charles V. communicated his plan to the Estates that no representative of the Pope should have been consulted on the establishment of a new system of religious organization.³

Charles V. himself was conscious of the risks he was running in setting up his "Imperial Interim religion." He therefore tried to acquit himself by throwing the responsibility of its inception on the Diet. The consideration had also certainly great weight with him that success would only then be possible when he had with him the active participation of the Estates in the scheme.⁴ It was therefore extremely displeasing to the Emperor when the ecclesiastical Electors refused to pronounce sentence on dogmatic questions which belonged to the Papal and conciliar tribunal. But many Protestants also had great objections to the scheme from distrust of the Emperor's Spanish theologians. Charles V. found himself in consequence obliged at last to form a committee of sixteen persons to deliberate on the means of securing Christian unity.⁵ Their consultations brought a fresh disappointment to the head of the Empire; careful as he had been to choose the members so as to represent as nearly as possible all classes in the Estates, the upshot of the commission was that they

¹ Cf. DRUFFEL, Beiträge, III., 63 *seq.*

² See BEUTEL, 30.

³ Sfondrato's letter of Jan. 16, 1548, and Nuntiaturberichte, X., 236.

⁴ WOLF, Interim, 51.

⁵ BEUTEL, 45; WOLF, 57; cf. Venet. Depeschen, II., 394-396.

were able to agree only on one point: that a removal of the religious dissensions was necessary!¹

The Emperor's attempt to shift the responsibility on to other men's shoulders having failed, no other course remained open to him save that of an arbitrary exercise of power.² The formula which was to be the instrument for realizing his schemes was fashioned with such secrecy that up to this day the most various opinions prevail as to the origin of the Interim. The first draft was from the pen of Julius Pflug, the follower of Erasmus, who hoped by yet further concessions to win over the Protestants. Other hands taking part in the work were those, on the Catholic side, of Michael Holding, Suffragan-Bishop of Mayence, the Carmelite, Eberhard Billick, and the Spanish theologians Soto and Malvenda; while on the Protestant side John Agricola, the conceited court preacher of Joachim of Brandenburg, took part in the composition of the formula which was to work the miracle of healing the religious breach which for a generation had been rending the Empire in twain. Many as the alterations were in the original draft, the main outlines of the ground-plan remained plainly visible.³

The Interim, or "Declaration of his Roman Imperial Majesty on the observance of religion within the Holy Empire until the decision of the General Council," consists of six-and-twenty chapters, the dogmatic statements of which are drawn up almost entirely in the Catholic sense but always in the mildest and often vaguest terms. Where

¹ Cf. PASTOR, *Reunionsbestrebungen*, 352 *seq.*; BEUTEL, 45 *seq.*; WOLF, 59.

² WOLF, 61.

³ Cf. PASTOR, *op. cit.*, 357 *seq.*; BEUTEL, 60 *seqq.*, 74 *seq.*; *Histor. Zeitschr.*, LXII., 326 *seq.* For the co-operation of Billick, see POSTINA, 96.

it could be done without detriment to dogma the form and statements approach very near to the Protestant standard, but fundamentally the definitions are mostly Catholic. On the seven Sacraments, the worship of Mary and the saints, monastic vows, fasts, and finally on the Pope and the episcopate, the Catholic doctrine is advanced. The doctrine of purgatory was passed over, and the definition of justification was wanting in the requisite precision; this was all the more suspicious as the Tridentine Council had already formulated the Catholic teaching on this crucial question. Although Charles had acknowledged in February 1547 this definition to be "most Catholic and holy," he now, in his zeal for the removal of the religious troubles, accepted in the "Interim," without regard for the authority of the Council, the discrepant formula of the mediatizing theologians.

Even the doctrine of the Mass, out of consideration for Protestant opinion, was represented in terms wanting in definiteness and precision. Still more unfortunate was the employment of expressions of such ambiguity on many articles that both parties were able to claim the statement of doctrine as favourable to their own particular view. The ceremonial of the Sacraments was left untouched. In every town and church possessing its own priests two Masses at least were to be said daily, and in the villages one was to be said on high festivals. The altars, vestments, vessels, banners, crosses, pictures, and images were to remain in the churches. Also the principal feasts, including Corpus Christi, the days of the Holy Virgin, of the Apostles and Saints, All Saints, and the patronal festivals of individual churches were to be more widely celebrated, Fridays and Saturdays kept as fasts, and the customary fast-days observed.

In order to facilitate for the Protestants entrance into the

old Church, which the Interim was to bring about, two important concessions were made: the marriage of the clergy and communion under both kinds, but only provisionally until the Council made known its decision. Tacit assent was given to the possession of appropriated Church property.

Introductory to the official acceptance of the Interim, which was finished in its entirety on the 12th of March 1548,¹ the Emperor entered into private negotiations with each Estate. The Electors Palatine and of Brandenburg were easily won, the latter having attempted for some time to take up a middle position between the old doctrine and the new. Maurice of Saxony was more difficult to handle, although he was at last invested on the 24th of February with the Electorate taken away from John Frederick. Personally, Maurice declared that he was indeed ready to accept a clearly expressed resolution of the Diet, but refused to bind himself to obligations without previous consultation with his theologians and his Estates. He could on this point call attention to the fact that previous to the Schmalkaldic wars he had, with the Emperor's knowledge and at his wish, given his subjects assurances regarding the maintenance of their religion. In spite of all his persuasions Charles only succeeded in coming to a feeble compromise which secured to the crafty Maurice his freedom from obligations. The other Protestant confederates of the Emperor, the Margrave Hans of Brandenburg-Cüstrin, as well as the representative of Strasburg, resolutely opposed, in the face of all expostulations, the acceptance of the Interim. On the other hand, Nuremberg, Ulm, and Augsburg gave in their adhesion.²

¹ This hitherto unknown date is supplied by a letter from Billick (POSTINA, 96).

² Cf. RANKE, V., 6th ed., 32 *seq.*; VI., 2nd ed., 264 *seq.*, 276 *seq.*; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 370 *seq.*, and particularly WOLF, 66 *seq.*

The strongest opposition to the Interim came from the Catholic Estates. Ecclesiastics as well as laymen were not willing that the Emperor, although only temporarily, should arrogate to himself the position of religious arbitrator for Catholics and attribute to the temporal power instead of to the infallible Church the determination of matters of faith.¹ The Catholic Estates were so far perfectly independent in their action that no Roman instigation could be proved. On the contrary, Bavaria had fanned and led this opposition far less from motives of Catholic zeal than from those of political rivalry. None save the Pope and the Council, declared the ecclesiastical Electors, had the right to consent to or to dispense and tolerate changes in respect of clerical marriage and communion under both kinds.²

Still more pointed was the protest of the Catholic princes and Estates, in the composition of which the Bavarian chancellor Eck had an important share. The Emperor was here made to understand in unmistakable terms that he was overstepping his authority when he presumed to handle definitions of doctrine which had been committed already to the Council; it was to be feared that general confusion, if not obstruction, to the Council would result. Let Charles use his influence with the Protestant Estates to make them repudiate their doctrines, those even of the Augsburg Confession, according to which they never lived. The concessions with regard to marriage and communion under both kinds were not permissible; both might be tolerated at the utmost in Protestant Estates until the Council gave its decision, but neither could be expressly permitted—no, not even by the Pope! Finally, there must be restitution of Church

¹ See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 685 *seq.*

² SASTROW, II., 320 *seq.*

property, free exercise of religion for those who had remained Catholic in a Protestant district, and absolute prohibition of innovations in districts that were already Catholic.¹ The Emperor refused to accept the protest of the princes, and used language of unprecedented harshness towards Eck, the Bavarian chancellor, whom he spoke of as "Judas," just as at a later date he simply expelled the Jesuit Bobadilla for having preached against the Interim in Augsburg.²

A remarkable concession on the part of Charles broke down the opposition of the Catholic princes. The latter finally determined, through their Council, to associate themselves with the milder remonstrance of the ecclesiastical Electors after having received the assurance that the Interim did not apply to Catholics, but had been arranged by the Emperor with no other intention than to draw the Protestant Estates once more to the Catholic religion with a view to their final submission.³

The motive for this important surrender was probably the fear felt by the Imperialists that the Pope might form an alliance with the Catholic princes of Germany in order to make common cause against the Interim.⁴ This explains the startling fact that Charles, with all his Catholic orthodoxy, obstinately debarred the spiritual head of Christendom from taking a part in negotiations which vitally affected the highest interests of religion. He evidently thought that when his great effort was crowned with success the Pope and the Council, for good or for evil, would be compelled to give their consent.

¹ DRUFFEL, Beiträge, III., 98; *cf.* PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 383.

² *Cf.* BUCHOLTZ, VI., 240 *seq.*; RIEZLER, IV., 399; *cf. supra*, p. 109.

³ *Cf.* BUCHOLTZ, VI., 235.
VOL. XII.

⁴ WOLF, 75.

The Emperor's love of arbitrary procedure in matters of religion was exemplified afresh by his behaviour in the question of the Council. At an earlier date he had pressed the Pope to come to a decision on the subject of the transference of the Council; now, when Paul III. seemed prepared to comply, and had summoned witnesses from Trent, the Emperor forbade the latter to obey the injunctions of their highest ecclesiastical ruler.¹ Nothing could be more characteristic of the Imperialist pretensions than the experience of Giuliano Ardinghella, who was sent by Cardinal Farnese, in agreement with the Pope, to Germany on matters connected with the Council. On reaching Augsburg on the 13th of March 1548 he found that the Emperor's representative claimed to lay down for the Papal plenipotentiaries the limits of their ecclesiastical faculties.²

It was therefore no matter for surprise when, at the end of April, on the receipt of the text of the Interim, for presentation to the Pope, Cardinal Sfondrato was apprised that this did not mean that the Pontiff's opinion thereon was invited, but simply that he was put in cognizance of its contents.³ Sfondrato on this occasion certainly did not delay in representing to the Emperor

¹ FRIEDENSBURG in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., xliii, n. 2. For the courteous but flat refusal of the Tridentine Fathers, dat. March 23, 1548, see PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 15, n. 3. Out of consideration for the Emperor the Pope temporarily withheld his decision on the question of the translation.

² Cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., xliii-xliv, 277, 287; *ibid.*, 470 *seq.*; see the instruction for Ardinghella, dated March 5, 1548, according to which Paul III. was ready to agree to the postponement, as desired by Charles V., of the judicial inquiry into the validity of the translation and to the sending of Legates or nuncios into Germany.

³ Cf. *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 295; PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 17; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 688.

that although the Interim formed no binding rule of faith, the promulgation of which was not within his Majesty's competence, but only a provisional permissive enactment, yet it must be taken into consideration that the draft in many places was so badly and ambiguously worded as to give the impression that what was aimed at was uniformity of words rather than unity of faith. Thus in the Interim the marriage of the clergy was conceded which, although forbidden by ecclesiastical and not by Divine law, could not be sanctioned by the temporal power, all the less so since the prohibition of marriage to those who have received priests' orders rests on an unbroken Apostolic tradition; further, the permission in the Interim to communicate the laity with the chalice was contrary to the decisions of many Councils. However that might be, he, Sfondrato, did not hold himself justified in pronouncing a verdict on matters of such grave importance. He would much rather await the sentence of the Pope and his special plenipotentiaries.

Charles had not the remotest intention of so doing. Urged by his political counsellors, and full of impatience to bring the religious reconciliation into being without delay, he believed that he would satisfy his conscience and the Catholic party if he made some alterations in the objectionable clauses of the Interim; provided, indeed, that such alterations would find favour with the Protestants.

From the Pope, Charles only looked with fear for hindrances to his intentions. His distrust was deepened by the prevalent belief in Augsburg that Paul III. was in alliance with France. It was also characteristic of the temper then reigning in the Emperor's court that Savonarola's sermons were largely read.¹ Suspicion and aversion increased on the journey of Prospero Santa

¹ Cf. *Nuntiaturreichte*, X., 277 *seq.*, 297 n.

Croce,¹ appointed nuncio to King Ferdinand, which was long protracted. The worst surmises were indulged in as to the Pope's dependence upon France. The fear of interference on the part of the French Government seemed not unfounded, since that body was as determined as ever to prevent Paul III. from coming to terms with the Emperor. A breach between the two would at once drive the Pope into the arms of Henry II. No means came amiss that could forward this end. The mission of Ardinghella gave France a pretext for threatening to recall her bishops and prelates from Bologna, while in Rome Cardinal du Bellay was hard at work to prevent the despatch of plenipotentiaries to the Emperor. If unsuccessful in this attempt, he was at least to manage so that they should not be present at the Diet, but betake themselves to some place agreed upon with the Estates of Germany.² Du Bellay found supporters in Cardinals Cupis and Carafa, who were anti-Spanish; the interests of Charles V. were safe in the loyal keeping of Cardinals Juan Alvarez de Toledo, Francesco Mendoza, and Cueva.

Paul III. weighed the matter without coming to any immediate resolution. He invited provisional opinions from the conciliar deputies in Rome and from the Legates in Bologna in order to be fully armed in case a decision should become imperative without longer delay.³ At last Santa Croce received instructions to represent to Charles V. that, in spite of several consultations, the difficulties of the Interim still appeared too great to admit of a final decision within the short space of time at the Pope's disposal. In order, however, to relieve the Emperor from suspense and uncertainty Santa Croce had been sent

¹ Cf. PIEPER, 108 *seq.*

² See Nuntiaturberichte, X., xlv, 476 *seq.*, 485 *seq.*

³ See *ibid.*, 317; cf. PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 16.

to announce that, within ten or twelve days at the latest, plenipotentiaries would be despatched with the most comprehensive faculties.¹ For this proceeding a leading motive was also the knowledge that the Emperor intended the plenipotentiaries to have only a superficial and formal share in the new organization of religion.² Charles V. was all the more surprised at the fresh postponement of a decision, as he had expected, from a letter of the 27th of April of Farnese, that Santa Croce would certainly bring with him satisfactory instructions not only on the matter of the Council, but concerning the mission of the plenipotentiaries.³

As soon as Charles saw clearly that he had been deceived he determined to show no further consideration for the Pope, and to go on with his religious policy on his own initiative entirely. In order to cut off the possibility of any protest he refused on one pretext and another to give Santa Croce an audience until the decisive step had been taken. Not until he had read aloud the Interim to the Estates in a solemn session of the Diet did he receive the nuncio together with Sfondrato. When both arrived punctually at the hour of audience they were obliged to wait for a short time, as the Emperor was still detained by the Diet. Santa Croce declared drily that his instructions, which concerned both the mission of the plenipotentiaries and the restitution of Piacenza, had been rendered nugatory by the announcement just made of the Interim; but, in spite of that, he produced them. Charles V. tried to justify his conduct on the ground that the Diet could no longer be

¹ See *Miscell. d. stor. Ital.*, V.^b, 1001 *seq.*; *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 316 *seq.*

² *Cf.* the expression of Santa Croce in Vivaldini's report in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 511.

³ Farnese's letter to Sfondrato, *ibid.*, X., 322, 323.

kept in any suspense. When the nuncio attempted to broach the subject of Piacenza he was interrupted by the remark that that was a private matter which was essentially one of domestic interest to the Farnese family and must be subordinate to affairs of public importance. The nuncio then tried to add something in reference to the Interim; but the Emperor rejoined haughtily and seriously that in this matter he had acted only as a legitimate and Catholic prince.¹

Santa Croce had informed the King of the Romans openly, before his audience with Charles V., that the Pope did not see what object there could be in sending Legates if they were not to possess full powers in dealing with the matter of the Interim. Santa Croce also reminded Ferdinand that Charles had allowed it to be said that it would suffice if the Legates' share in the undertaking were restricted to maintaining the prestige of the Holy See, while in other respects they were simply to register his wishes and do nothing to destroy a plan which he had brought into existence with much trouble and anxiety. Paul III. was of opinion that if he were to send Legates to Augsburg only to execute the commands of Charles V., he would virtually be abandoning his office, and the Emperor would then become the Pope.²

In order to make the Interim acceptable to the Catholic princes and also perhaps to allay some personal scruples of conscience, Charles allowed at the eleventh hour some changes to be made in the formula. The proposal to the Diet was based on the understanding that the Interim should be "personally arranged" by Charles. In the

¹ The as yet undiscovered report of Santa Croce of May 16, 1548, in PALLAVICINI, l. 10, c. 17, n. 7; *cf.* also Sfondrato's letter of the same day in the Nuntiaturberichte, X., 328 *seq.*

² Vivaldini's report of May 16, 1548 *ibid.*, X., 511.

deliberations in the Diet which immediately followed an opposition already made itself conspicuous, resting in part on the objection that the formula ought not to apply to all the Estates but only to the Protestant. Regardless of this, the Elector of Mayence declared in the name of the Estates that since they had entrusted to the Emperor personally the provisional settlement of the religious dissensions until such time as a decision was delivered by a General Council, it was right that they should pay obedience to the Imperial decree. As this declaration was received without contradiction, the Emperor drew the conclusion that his ordinances met with general acceptance. He was soon to learn a very different lesson.

Although the further proceedings were kept as private as possible, Sfondrato very soon became aware that the Elector Maurice was by no means enamoured of the Interim, and that in the towns the dislike of the scheme was still more intense. From conversations with Charles's confessor, Soto, and others he gathered that the Emperor intended in any case to push his new settlement of religious affairs in Germany to a finish without the Pope. In an audience given to Sfondrato on the 21st of May, Charles made no disguise of his distrust of Paul III., and declared that he would carry out his undertaking without Papal assistance; the Legates must appear with adequate faculties, otherwise their mission would be useless. In the matter of Piacenza he was determined to do nothing as long as his demands were unfulfilled.

With regard to the Interim, Sfondrato was able to report that the difficulties were steadily increasing.¹ Santa Croce said the same with fuller detail in his despatch of May the 22nd. In his attempts to control opinion in the towns,

¹ See Sfondrato's letters of May 19, 22, and 23, 1548, in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., 333 *seq.*, 337 *seq.*

Charles reminded them that he had promised to make no changes in matters of religion without the consent of the Council. Santa Croce thought that the Interim was only a threat by which Charles was endeavouring to browbeat the Pope.¹

Undeterred by the strong opposition to the Imperial decree on religion manifested by the Protestants, Charles V. in the middle of June indulged in another act of aggression on the purely ecclesiastical régime by proposing to the Diet as supplementary to the Interim a long-considered scheme of reform for the Catholic clergy.² Here also he was acting once more from good intentions: by sweeping away abuses in her government the nearer approach of Protestants to the Church would be facilitated. But excellent as many of the provisions in the new ordinance of reform were, they were incapable from the first of being effectually enforced owing to the absence of any legitimate authority, the life-giving principle of all legislation, ecclesiastical or other. Ordinances dealing with the choice and ordination of the clergy, with the administration of the Sacraments, with Church discipline, with excommunication and the like, lay outside the province of the temporal ruler.³ Even Sfondrato, who hitherto had suffered with an excess of patience the arbitrary proceedings of the Emperor, found this too much. The policy of the Emperor, he complained, was dictated by an unscrupulous selfishness; whoever dared to oppose

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 339 *seq.*

² "Formula reformationis" in HARTZHEIM, VI., 741 *seq.*; *cf.* PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 392 *seq.*; POSTINA, 97; see also BRAUBURGER, De formula reformationis eccl. ab imp. Carolo V. in comit. Aug. statibus eccl. oblata, Mogunt., 1782.

³ *Cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 57; PALLAVICINI, l. II, c. 2; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 691.

him was suspected and calumniated. The Emperor, Santa Croce reported at the same time, was puffed up with success and the knowledge that behind him was an army of four-and-twenty thousand men.¹

This consciousness of armed power explains the attempt on the part of Charles not merely to reorganize the Protestant religion but also to reform the Catholic clergy without seeking the participation of the Pope. Had he succeeded in imposing his influence on the internal affairs of the Church so as to carry out both these schemes, he would inevitably have held a place as the head of the reunited and pacified Empire such as no Emperor had held for centuries, a place from which he could have dictated his commands concerning the questions of religion as well as the affairs of Italy to Pope and Council alike.

The declaration of the Elector of Mayence that the Estates would acquiesce in the Interim was much too premature. The Elector Maurice of Saxony, the Margrave Hans of Brandenburg-Cüstrin, and the Count Palatine Wolfgang of Zweibrücken put in protests almost at once. The towns of the Empire took up the position that they must first report home. Charles did all he could to prevent a combination of these discontented spirits with the rest of the Protestant opposition. He succeeded, and Maurice was prevailed upon to make a "roundabout" declaration and was then dismissed. Hans of Cüstrin, whose opposition was stubborn, was promptly ordered by the Emperor to quit the Diet. From the Count Palatine Wolfgang, Charles was content to receive the assurance that he would do all that his conscience allowed. The weaker towns were cowed by threats, and in the course of June the submission of the majority to the Imperial ordinance was received. It was a greater success for Charles V. that not merely the

¹ See *Nuntiaturberichte*, X., xlvi, 374 *seq.*, 377 *seq.*

Electors Palatine and of Brandenburg but also the captive Landgrave of Hesse took the same course.¹ Thereupon Charles took steps to close the Diet, and with the pronouncement of the Recess on the 30th of June, amid no dissentient voices, the Interim became the law of the Empire. After the archbishops, bishops, and prelates present in Augsburg had declared their agreement on the 23rd of June with the formula of reformation, the latter was also published.²

To all outward appearance the Emperor had almost reached his goal. All that now remained to do was to carry the decrees into execution. For this the state of affairs in south Germany afforded the most favourable prospect, where Charles could make a strong impression by the weight of personality and the fear of his dreaded Spanish soldiery.

Even if all the South German States tried to save as much as was possible of their Protestant profession of religion by means of delays, excuses, and petitions, yet to all outward appearance they more or less submitted to the Interim. Where serious opposition was shown the Emperor took decisive measures of reprisal. The hostile preachers had now to yield and submit to the same fate which they had so often brought down on their opponents. In Augsburg and Ulm the opposition was broken down by a change of constitution. Even Constance had to accept the Interim and permit the restoration of Catholic worship. The city had indeed repelled successfully an onslaught of the Spaniards, but in view of the threatening attitude maintained by Charles V. deemed it advisable to

¹ See HÄBERLIN, I., 308 *seq.* ; WOLF, Interim, 80 *seq.* ; WOLF, I., 427 ; PASTOR, Reunionsbestrebungen, 391 *seq.* ; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 353, 390, 391 *seq.*, 393.

² See HÄBERLIN, I., 371 ; DRUFFEL, Beiträge, III., 103.

place itself under the protection of his brother Ferdinand's suzerainty. Other places, on the contrary, with the powerful Nuremberg at their head, observed with success a course of conduct calculated simply to keep up the semblance of obedience. Duke Ulrich of Wurtemberg also published the Interim only to the effect that no hindrances would be put in the way of its observance. Here the Catholic Church gained nothing by the ordinance, but on the contrary suffered much disadvantage.

The Landgrave Philip of Hesse was ready to purchase his freedom at any price. His standpoint was certainly at first "to accept everything in order afterwards to observe nothing." After making closer acquaintance with the Interim, he formed the opinion, however, that the formula might be accepted without scruple, since it contained nothing contrary to Christian teaching. He afterwards tried to bring his preachers round to this opinion, but with a very scanty measure of success. In the Palatinate and Julier-Cleves things turned out well for the Emperor, and the new ordinance was there most thoroughly carried out. Even the Margrave Albert of Brandenburg-Kulmbach showed himself amenable, despite the opposition among his preachers. On the other hand, it was in the highest degree disconcerting that the Prince Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, who was often looked upon as the author of the new enactment, showed no enthusiasm for its execution, and tried to deceive the Emperor by a mere show of obedience. The wily Maurice of Saxony did his best to steer his course between the Emperor on the one hand and the Catholic Estates on the other. The Interim of Leipzig published by him contained, with the exception of some concessions, more semblance than reality. Generally speaking, this ambiguously worded document remained a thing of

ink and parchment; practically the religious conditions of the Electorate remained precisely where they were. An unconditional negative was offered to the Interim by the captive John Frederick, whose son had not much more to lose. Magdeburg and the Hanseatic towns followed suit, their remoteness from the centre of Imperial power rendering them immune from danger.¹

The ill will of the majority of the upper ranks of society was combined in many quarters with the bitterest opposition from the mass of the people; the opinions and interests of countless numbers had already become deeply rooted in the Church system. It now became apparent with what success, in the course of a single generation, the reforming theologians had worked as preachers and writers to bring odium on all that was Catholic. Charles V. had not put an end, as, after his victory, he had the power to do, to this movement. The permission which he had granted, in the hour of success,² was now turned against him. The Protestant zealots were successful in augmenting, by means of a cleverly conducted agitation, the hostile feeling of the people towards the "papistical" Interim. Public opinion was worked upon by means of libels, ballads, caricatures, satirical woodcuts of the coarsest kind. In glaring colours the new organization was displayed to the common people as an anti-Christian monstrosity: as a three-headed dragon with a serpent's tail, a scorpion's sting, and claw feet. "In Latin the name of this worm is Interim." "The devil himself," it was announced, "was author of the Interim," and the Pope, his viceroy, wished to force it upon Germany.

¹ See JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 696 *seq.* To the bibliography there given add: F. HERMANN, *Das Interim in Hessen, Marburg, 1901.*

² *Cf. Corp. Ref., VI., 570 seq.; MENZEL, III., 128 seq.*

"The Pope would drive the German land
 To bend, a slave, at his command,
 And for God's Word receive from him
 That Devil's creed, the Interim."¹

As soon as Paul III. received news of the Interim he ordered the new formula of religion to be laid before the expert theologians in Rome and Bologna. The latter found fault not merely with various points of detail contained in the Interim, but also laid stress on the principal sides of the question in the decision of which the Emperor, a layman, had overstepped the legitimate compass of his activity and directly infringed on the province of Papal and conciliar authority. The Legates of the Council called in the Dominican, Ambrogio Catarino, and the Augustinian Hermit, Seripando, to examine the draft. They wrote on the 2nd of May 1548 to Cardinal Farnese that, in the exposition of the doctrines of original sin and of justification, the decisions of the Tridentine Council must not be departed from. With regard to the treatment of doctrines not yet decided upon by the Council, they presented a series of strictures on the formulæ contained in the Interim, into which they went in fuller detail in May in another declaration.²

¹ Besides the writings adduced by PASTOR (*Reunionsbestrebungen*, 394 *seq.*) and JANSSEN-PASTOR (III, 18th ed., 699), *cf.* also Serapcum, 1862, 289 *seqq.*, 320 *seq.*

² *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. 10, c. 17; RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 51, 54, 56; Massarelli, *Diarium* IV., ed. MERKLE, I., 736 *seq.*, 773; CALENZIO, *Documenti*, 267, 268, 271. The Roman objections to the Interim are in the Vatican Library in *Cod. Vat., 3931: "Interim cum adnotationibus." Here in the preface (f. 1) to Paul III. it is laid down that in matters of dogma the decision rests with Pope and Council only; then follow: ff. 2-57, the text of the Interim; ff. 59-64, the strong objections of "Franc. de Castelione, general. praedic." (without author's name; also in Secret Archives of the Vatican, XI., 45, f. 515 *seqq.*); ff.

Mendoza saw in the Papal consultations over the Interim only the intention of protracting the decision on the affairs of Germany. Paul III. represented to him in vain that the Diet had no authority to deal independently with ecclesiastical matters; in vain he indicated objectionable passages in the Interim.¹ An assertion of such objections was cut short by the action of the Emperor, which was as sudden as it was arbitrary. When the news reached Rome on the 24th of May it naturally made the worst impression on the Curia. It seemed unprecedented that the Emperor should arrogate to himself the right of decision in matters of faith and attempt to exercise this authority by confirming erroneous teaching against the mind of the Church and the decrees of the Council. A consistory had been summoned for the 25th of May to draw up the faculties of the Legates about to be sent to Germany, but this was now abandoned. A more fitting subject of deliberation was the arbitrary conduct of the Emperor, which had aroused indignation in the whole College of Cardinals. The French were jubilant, for they now felt certain that a breach was inevitable between the Emperor and the Pope and that the latter would give his unconditional adhesion to their own King.²

Paul III. at first shared the feelings of the Cardinals; indeed, he said to the Florentine envoy, "The die is

67-68, **those of the "Epic. Scalens.;" f. 76 *seq.*, further remarks on the Interim; see also Cod. Vat., 6222, f. 121 *seq.* Cf. also NOVAES, VII., 51; BERNINO, IV., 461; MERKLE, I., 771; and for Francesco Romeo de Castiglione, HEFNER'S work, Entstehung des Trienter Recht-fertigungsdekretes, Paderborn, 1909, 54.

¹ See Mendoza's letter of May 23, 1548, in the Nuntiaturberichte, X., 679 *seq.*

² See Nuntiaturberichte, X., 343, 345, 688; DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 114 *seq.*; cf. PALLAVICINI, l. II, c. I.

cast."¹ It seems as if the Pope wished at once to give judgment on the validity of the translation of the Council, and immediately after the consistory he sent for the four Cardinals entrusted with this question. Yet it is doubtful whether he really intended to take such a step;² with cautious wisdom, he took no hurried action, but first invited the opinion of experienced advisers. The latter were greatly at variance. Del Monte, in the first burst of anger, had proposed a removal of the Council to Rome, but came round afterwards to the view of the French ambassadors at Bologna. The latter, on hearing of the publication of the Interim, declared immediately that the Pope should now pronounce in favour of the validity and then suspend the Council until a more convenient season should arrive. Cardinal Cervini, on the contrary, preferred that the Council should resume its work at Bologna, but that no session should be held until every effort had been made to try and arrive at an understanding with the Emperor.³

The Pope had entertained the idea, for a moment, of removing the Council to a Venetian city and so making an end to the controversy; but the Republic would not consent to this on account of the Turks and the Protestants.⁴ As no decision on the validity of the translation was given, the Council remained for more than a year longer in Bologna without taking any action as regarded the Interimistic suspension. On the 4th of June Girolamo Dandino, Bishop of Imola, was sent to France, where he had represented Paul III already from 1546 to 1547. The

¹ See Nuntiaturberichte, X., 360 (report of June 2, 1548); *cf.* the letter of the Portuguese envoy of June 12, 1548, in Corp. dipl. Port., VI., 259.

² See Nuntiaturberichte, X., xlvi, 345.

³ PALLAVICINI, I. II, c. 1.

⁴ CAMPANA, 517 *seq.*

ostensible pretext for his mission was the marriage of Orazio Farnese with Diana of Poitiers, the natural daughter of King Henry II., while the real purpose was the consideration of the conciliar question and the contemplated alliance.¹

On the day before Dandino's departure Mendoza had an audience of the Pope. His attempt to excuse the Emperor was waved aside by Paul III., who said that it was to be deplored that Charles should allow himself to be led by bad advisers; apart from that, the Interim contained objectionable provisos, and was an infringement on the spiritual sphere. Mendoza tried, but in vain, to get a hearing on the question of the mission of the Legates, and of the decision on the validity of the translation. Paul III. also withheld any decision regarding the despatch of Pietro Bertano to Germany, which had been spoken of for some time. While on the affairs of Piacenza, the Pope insisted that the matter was not one only of private concern, but that it affected public interests, and could only be satisfactorily settled when good relations with the Emperor were restored.²

Soon after this audience orders were given for the recall of Cardinal Sfondrato and the despatch of Pietro Bertano, Bishop of Fano, in his place as nuncio to Germany.³ The situation then became still worse owing to the Emperor's arbitrary behaviour with regard to the reform of the German clergy. In the first moment of excitement in Rome, it was believed that Charles only intended to represent the Pope as a defaulter to duty,

¹ See PALLAVICINI, *loc. cit.*; PIEPER, 132 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 363 n.; FONTANA, III., 381 *seq.*

² See Farnese's and Maffei's reports in the Nuntiaturberichte, X., 360 *seq.*

³ *Ibid.*, X., 372.

wherefore the temporal head of Christendom was forced to take the questions of reform and of the Council into his own hands.¹ The aged Pope was furious. The French drew such vivid pictures of the dangers to which his person was exposed that he took special measures of security. The watches were strengthened, and Ottavio Farnese had to sleep in the ante-chamber.² It was at this time that Paul III. told one of the Cardinals that he hoped to survive the Emperor, but that in any case, before he died, he would yet do something which would set the whole world talking.³ Cardinal Farnese spread a report that Bertano had instructions to address to Charles the first admonition which precedes the greater censures of the Church.⁴ That, however, was not by any means the object of his mission; as a matter of fact, the first outbreak of temper in the Curia at the attack of Charles on the privileges of the Church very soon gave place to a calmer estimate of circumstances. Seeing how uncertain French support was, and how determined the Venetians were to remain neutral, it seemed imperative to make use even of the situation created by the Emperor, and of the difficulties that situation involved; all the more so as Charles V., at the same time, was inclined to come round, having declared by word of mouth to the ecclesiastical Estates that he did not wish, by his reform ordinances, to limit episcopal authority, and even kept in view the restoration of ecclesiastical property.⁵

The choice of Bertano seemed excellent. This prelate, indeed, a member of the Dominican Order, possessed not only the entire confidence of the Pope, but that also of the

¹ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 384.

² Legaz. di Serristori, 168.

³ Nuntiaturberichte, X., 385, 699.

⁴ See Farnese's letter of June 13, 1548, in DE LEVA, V., 5.

⁵ See DE LEVA, V., 3 *seq.*; Nuntiaturberichte, X., 385 *seq.*

Emperor from the time of his previous mission. With Cardinal Madruzzo he was on terms of close friendship. In order to give no occasion for suspicion he did not pay a visit, on his journey through Bologna, to Cardinal del Monte, hated by the Imperialist party. He apologized for this want of courtesy on the score of his rapid journey.¹

Bertano reached Trent on the 23rd of June, where Madruzzo instructed him frankly on the condition of Germany. On the 30th of June he reached Augsburg, and with Sfondrato was received in audience on the 2nd of July by Charles V. In this long interview it was made clear how much importance Charles attached to the mission of a Legate with full faculties, as without them his Interim must remain a dead letter. Santa Croce, as well as Sfondrato, advised the Pope to make the experiment by sending the Legates, a step which would also be of advantage in the matter of Piacenza.² The negotiations between the Emperor and Bertano seemed to give satisfaction to both parties. The nuncio, in his letter, said very confidently that Charles V. would be willing to accommodate the Pope in private matters if Rome would only show a spirit of concession in public affairs.³ Bertano's proposal, that the reform of the Church should be undertaken in Rome by all or a portion of the Fathers of the Council, aimed at making a clean sweep of the old controversy over the validity of Trent or Bologna. Charles could not decline this proposal, as he had made it himself through Mendoza in February, but he wished that all this should be without prejudice to the Synod of Trent. Farnese shrank from giving a written promise to this effect to Fernando Montesa, who, as secretary to Mendoza, was at

¹ See PALLAVICINI, l. II, c. 1; *cf.* DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 122.

² See Nuntiaturberichte, X., 388 *seq.*, 398 *seq.*

³ See DRUFFEL, I., 128.

that time officially occupied in Rome. If, in spite of these difficulties, an agreement was reached afterwards, its terms were partly of a very general description.¹

This was the source of new dissensions between Emperor and Pope. Each of the two parties in Rome described the contents of the agreement as being something different from what it was.² Paul III. sought, by threats of an alliance with France, to force the Imperialists to give way. The negotiations on this subject were again more actively carried on. Not in consequence of these, but in order to carry out his own designs in northern Italy, King Henry II. suddenly appeared in Piedmont in the beginning of August, avowedly to inspect the fortresses there, but really with another aim in view: Ottavio Farnese was at the head of a conspiracy against Ferrante Gonzaga, the murderer of his father, and the French King hoped, in case of its success, to derive some advantage. Henry sent his secretary Aubespine to Rome to restrain the Pope from making concessions to Charles and to gain his consent to the alliance in the form which the King desired. When Aubespine arrived in Rome on the 23rd of August the situation had already undergone a complete alteration. The conspiracy against Ferrante had been discovered, and disturbances in France had called Henry back again. The King still insisted on the immediate surrender of Parma to his vassal Orazio Farnese as the necessary condition preliminary to an active league and the recapture of Piacenza. Paul III. refused to enter into this compact; Aubespine therefore left Rome on the 26th of August without having settled anything.³

¹ See DE LEVA, V., 7.

² See DRUFFEL, I., 135; DE LEVA, V., 8 *seq.*

³ See MAURENBRECHER, 202 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, I., 156; DE LEVA, V., 12 *seq.*

Five days later the Imperial diplomacy experienced a triumph. Paul III. showed an inclination to meet the Emperor's wish that Legates should be sent to Germany. In a consistory on the 31st of August three bishops, not Cardinals, probably out of consideration for Madruzzo, were appointed. Besides Bertano there were also Luigi Lippomano, coadjutor of Verona, and Sebastiano Pighini, who shortly before had been nominated to Ferentino.¹ In the same consistory the Pope approved the Bull prescribing the Legatine faculties to be used in Germany; the document was read out without any further discussion or voting, as the French Cardinals wished.² Long consultations had taken place beforehand which presented great difficulties, as the Pope was anxious to avoid any appearance that his Legates were instrumental in carrying out Imperial ordinances which he had himself regarded as encroachments on his authority. Experienced theologians, Cardinals Cervini and del Monte as conciliar Legates, a deputation of the Segnatura, finally the commission of Cardinals appointed for the affairs of the Council, were asked their opinion. The opinions of the last named guided the decisions of Paul III. on the most important points.³

The faculties were drawn up in such a way that they gave an opportunity to the Legates in employing them to remind Charles of the incident of Piacenza. Even in other respects everything was so arranged that on the

¹ See Acta Consist. in MERKLE, I. 792.

² See Montesa's report of Sept. 10, 1548, in DRUFFEL, I., 155; Serristori's letter of Aug. 31, 1548 (State Archives, Florence); the Bull in LE PLAT, IV., 121 *seq.*; the instruction for the Legates in LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 395 *seq.*, with the incorrect date 1542. Cf. also Gött. Gel. Anzeigen, 1884, II., 583 *seq.*

³ See RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 46 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, I., 146 *seq.*; DE LEVA, V., 18 *seq.*

development of this question very much depended. The two Legates prolonged their journey purposely, and did not join Bertano in Brussels, where the Emperor in the meantime had come, until the 23rd of December.¹ Pighini's experiences on the road were more than depressing. He found an outward show of religion, occasioned by the Emperor's victory and his ordinances, but the temper of the people was more than ever in sympathy with the movement of innovation. Mass was said almost everywhere, but in empty churches; nobody asked the nuncios to exercise their functions, and not once were the customary observances of courtesy and respect shown to them. Pighini concluded, from all that he had seen, that the religious troubles in Germany would find no settlement by means of the Interim; nothing could be done in that direction except by measures of extreme severity.²

Charles V. was no stranger to the adverse turn of affairs in the Empire. In October 1548 he expressed to his brother Ferdinand his anxiety lest all his efforts for the pacification of Germany might be in vain.³ How completely the policy of the Diet of Augsburg had failed he

¹ See DÖLLINGER, *Beiträge*, I., 155; MAURENBRECHER, 209; DE LEVA, V., 21 *seqq.* Mendoza had already, on Sept. 1, asked for the alteration of the faculties (see Serristori's report of Sept. 1, 1548, in State Archives, Florence).

² See PALLAVICINI, I. II, c. 2; DE LEVA, V., 23 *seq.* Pighini's comfortless *reports, dated Mayence, Nov. 5 and 16, 1548 (*Carte Cerv.*, 22, f. 17 *seq.*, in State Archives, Florence), agree with Lippomano's observations. The latter *wrote on Dec. 6, 1548, from Cologne to Cardinal Cervini: "Siamo venuti in questa città già X giorni, nella quale anchora che sia catholicissima, non vi è mai compassa persona a vederci, nè del consiglio nè del clero, et il r^{mo} arcivescovo si trova absente in Vestvalia. Il caso è che costoro tutti non conoscono nè vogliono conoscere persona se non che dipenda da S. M^{ta} o che venga con suo ordine, et già l' habbiamo provato per tutta l' Alta Germania."

³ See DRUFFEL, I., 171.

certainly did not yet realize; on the contrary, to the astonishment of clear-sighted observers, he clung with characteristic tenacity for some time longer to the execution of his religious decrees, even after their total futility had been established beyond contradiction.¹ All these well-intentioned efforts were doomed to misfortune. Years before, the strict Catholic party had insisted on the radical defect that the management of ecclesiastical affairs by the laity without permission from the highest authority in the Church was inadmissible.² It caused profound grief that a monarch of such high reputation and of such sincere devotion to the Catholic faith should, at the cost of bodily suffering and sore anxiety of mind, have been led astray by erroneous judgments on matters of religious belief and by the unscrupulous counsels of politicians.

The decrees of the Diet on reform were not less ineffectual than those on the Interim. Here too the penalty had to be paid for issuing a whole series of reforming decrees on the duties of bishops, the visitation of dioceses, the foundation of chairs of theology, without consulting the authority of Church, Pope, or Council. Moreover, the Imperial ordinances only stated what reforms were to take place, but not how they were to be carried out, or how the difficulties, which certainly were to be expected, were to be overcome. All recognition is due to those German bishops who, in their provincial synods, not merely tried to give effect to the Augsburg decrees, but also to supplement them in such a way that they should be brought into line with the doctrinal decisions already pronounced by the Council of Trent. Even if this enthusiasm soon slackened, yet these Synods did effective work as pioneers

¹ Cf. JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 691.

² Cf. ORLANDINUS, Hist. Soc. Jesu, I., l. 4, n. 112; RANKE, Deutsche Gesch., IV., 6th ed., 255.

of subsequent reformation.¹ Still the religious affairs of Germany remained at first in a deplorable condition.

The reception given to Lippomano and Pighini, the Papal Legates, was far from promising. In the audience of presentation on the 3rd of January 1549 the Emperor complained of the Pope's dilatoriness and of the protracted journey of his representatives.² In their conversations with the ministers the greatest difficulties arose, as the Legates had not brought a general permission for the marriage of priests, but only a dispensation for particular cases where, unfortunately, no other course was possible. With regard to the permission in the Interim that priests who had entered into wedlock should not only preach, but also administer the Sacraments, the Emperor himself had at that time serious scruples. But Ferdinand I. and the Emperor's council were of opinion that this enactment must hold good, otherwise the Interim would be made impracticable owing to the want of priests. The Legates reported the matter to Rome; their opinion was that such a concession was not permissible.³

When the Imperialists, whose claims were always being pushed forward, advanced with yet a further demand that full powers should be transferred to the bishops and other suitable persons, the Legates interposed with clearly defined counter-demands: the expulsion of the Protestant preachers and authors, the prohibition to print or sell their books, the restitution of illegally appropriated Church

¹ Cf. HÄBERLIN, I., 498 *seq.*; WOLF, I., 440 *seq.*; PHILLIPS, Die Diözesansynode, Freiburg, 1849, 76 *seq.*; Histor.-polit. Bl., XXXV., 1154 *seq.*; Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr., 1884, 665 *seq.*; LOSERTH in Archiv für österr. Gesch., LXXXV., 143 *seqq.*

² See the nuncio's letter of Jan. 3, 1549, in DE LEVA, V., 24.

³ LAEMMER, Mon. Vat., 394, 396; DRUFFEL, I., 186 *seq.*; DE LEVA, V., 24 *seq.*

property, and the reform of the Church in Germany under the direction of the Pope. Charles V. declared with some excitement that such measures could not be considered until the salutary effects of the concessions of the Interim had been tested ; he would not give permission to the prelates of Trent to go to Rome to discuss the question of reform until the faculties had first been put into operation. Paul III., who attached great importance to an early assemblage in Rome of the reforming episcopate, thereupon gave orders that no difficulties should be raised to the transfer of plenary powers to persons designated by the Emperor.¹

Fresh delays were now caused by the further demand of the Imperialists for the issue of a Bull declaring that the dispensations at the bestowal of the Legates should be valid until such time as a Council pronounced a decision upon them. Cardinal Farnese, acting on a Papal order, sent instructions to Bertano on the 26th of April 1549 which removed this difficulty. It was to be left to the Legates' discretion to fix the time for which the dispensations to communicate under both kinds, or concessions of a similar kind, were to be granted, upon the condition however, that such period of time should not extend beyond the duration of the Council.² As soon as a satisfactory agreement had been reached in May concerning the transference of the faculties, the necessary Bulls were printed and sent by the Emperor to the bishops of Germany with the injunction that they were to proceed in compliance with them.³

¹ Cf. MAURENBRECHER, 209 ; DE LEVA, V., 25-27.

² PALLAVICINI, l. 11, c. 2.

³ See LE PLAT, IV., 121 *seq.* ; DRUFFEL, I., 224 *seq.*, 883 *seq.* ; DE LEVA, V., 29. RANKE (V., 6th ed., 78) says : " On 18th August 1549 appeared Cardinal Otto von Truchsess, Bishop of Augsburg, to whom if to anyone must be attributed the character of an orthodox adherent

If the Pope had entertained the hope that Charles V. would now show himself more conciliatory on questions still awaiting settlement, he was completely out of his reckoning. The despatch of the German bishops to Trent and the restoration of Piacenza were both matters on which the Emperor was as unwilling as ever to meet the demands of Paul III.

As a mediator in the affairs of Piacenza, Count Giulio Orsini had been employed by the Pope. Deceived by the compliments and general promises of the Imperialist minister, Orsini looked upon the surrender of Piacenza as

of the Roman Curia. He took his place in his cathedral-church of Augsburg with all the pomp due to his rank, preceded by his cross, the silver sceptre, and the Cardinal's hat. He mounted a pulpit specially erected for him and hung with red velvet in order to announce that the Interim contained nothing that was hurtful or onerous." From a letter of Cardinal Otto, dat. Dillingen, Aug. 3, 1549 (WINTER, I., 151), it is clear that his Indults comprised not only the Communion under both kinds but also priestly marriage. In DRUFFEL (Beiträge, I., 287) there is another letter from the Cardinal, dat. Dillingen, Sept. 18, 1549, according to which he had declared in Augsburg that "the Emperor had obtained from the Pope an Indult for communion *sub utraque specie* and for priestly marriage." EGELHAAF (II., 521) declares emphatically "that by this step on the Pope's part final recognition was now given by the Church to the Imperial decree; the opposition hitherto displayed by the adherents of the old Faith must now for good or evil be silenced, and this was of all the greater importance as the General of the Dominicans, Romäus himself, had associated himself with this opposition in a written protest. The Emperor at once issued instructions to the German bishops enjoining them henceforth to ordain clergy for pastoral duty on the basis of the Interim in Protestant countries, which had not hitherto been done according to ecclesiastical order." The proclamation of the Indult concerning marriage of priests and communion under both kinds was not, however, a recognition of the Interim as a whole, as no document to that effect is forthcoming. With regard to the Papal Indult, Ranke, for the sake of clearness, ought to have referred also to DRUFFEL, Beiträge, I., 292.

a certainty. On Christmas Eve 1548 he arrived in Rome, where his presence was awaited with all the greater expectation as Bertano's diplomacy was causing great dissatisfaction.¹ He brought no written, only oral, communications from Charles and Granvelle. These went so far that, as Cattaneo reported to Cardinal Madruzzo, it would have been a miracle if they were ever carried out. Long consultations followed,² and Giulio Orsini, to the great disgust of the French party, was again sent to the Emperor in January 1549. From this second mission he returned to Rome on the 27th of March with renewed hopes of the most sanguine kind; but Paul III. was now proof against deception. When Cardinal du Bellay congratulated him on the settlement of the dispute about Piacenza, he remarked that nothing was yet known for certain, Orsini had only brought back instructions for Mendoza empowering the latter to negotiate further.³ There was afterwards some talk of sending Cardinal Farnese to the Emperor. In the end Orsini was again appointed in April, in order to push on the execution of the promises and to furnish documentary proof of the Papal rights over Piacenza. At the same time the nuncio Bertano was ordered to use his influence, in the same sense, with the Emperor.⁴

¹ See Buonanni's *reports, dat. Rome, Nov. 25 and Dec. 15, 1548 (State Archives, Florence).

² See in Appendix No. 37 Cattaneo's letter of Dec. 29, 1548 (Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck); *cf.* also CAMPANA, 451 *seq.*

³ See DRUFFEL, I., 187 *seq.*; *cf.* CAMPANA, 456 *seq.*; the *Istruzione al S. Giulio Orsini, dat. Jan. 11, 1549, in the Bibliotheca Pia, 222, f. 1 *seq.*, in Secret Archives of the Vatican, as well as in the Doria Pamphili Archives, Rome, Istruz, I., 362 *seq.*

⁴ See CUGNONI, *Prose di A. Caro*, 136 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, I., 216, 217 *seq.*, 883. Orsini left on April 26, 1549, according to Scipione Gabrielli's *report (State Archives, Siena).

On the 8th of April 1549 the long-expected¹ nomination of new Cardinals took place. Applications had been made from all quarters. Morone in December 1548 had advanced the claims of Paul de Varda, Archbishop of Gran, in the name of Ferdinand I.,² and at the same time Cardinal du Bellay had pestered Paul III. with importunate demands.³ The Pope had given no heed to any of these solicitations. Only four Italians, who were in his intimacy and through whom he hoped to traverse the schemes of Cardinal Gonzaga with regard to the choice of his successor,⁴ were appointed on the 8th of April 1549. They were Girolamo Verallo, Gian Angelo de' Medici, Filiberto Ferreri, and Bernardino Maffei.⁵

The Emperor's answer to the demand for Piacenza was anxiously awaited in the Curia. At first there were hopes which even Mendoza encouraged,⁶ but the disillusionment came quickly. The answer which both representatives of the Pope received simultaneously on the 12th of June was as follows: From a minute examination of the documents submitted to Mendoza the conclusion had been come to that neither the Holy See nor the feudatories thereof had any rights to Piacenza or Parma. Nevertheless, the Emperor was willing to send his court

¹ Cf. Buonanni's reports of Sept. 25, Oct. 29, and Nov. 25, 1548 (State Archives, Florence). For the obstacle to the creation at Christmas 1548, see RIBIER, II., 179 *seq.*; DRUFFEL, I., 183 *seq.*, 185.

² See Buonanni's *report, dat. Rome, Dec. 14, 1548 (State Archives, Florence); cf. DRUFFEL, I., 184.

³ See Buonanni's **report, dat. Rome, Dec. 17, 1548 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ See DRUFFEL, I., 223 *seq.*

⁵ See CIACONIUS, III., 735 *seq.*; CARDELLA, IV., 292 *seqq.* For Cardinal Medici's previous life, see ŠUSTA, Pius IV., Prag, 1900, 8 *seqq.*

⁶ See the *report of Serristori, June 11, 1549 (State Archives, Florence).

official, Martin Alfonso da Rio, with a proposal of agreement. This envoy, who also presented a written statement of the claims of the Empire on both cities, once more set before the Pope the necessity of his relinquishing his pretensions. He also announced that Charles, "not as a compensation but as a free mark of favour," would bestow on his son-in-law Ottavio Farnese a domain in the kingdom of Naples of the value of 40,000 ducats per annum in return for his surrender of Parma.¹

Instead of restoring Piacenza Charles was now demanding the acquisition of Parma as well! The nuncio Bertano, who hitherto had been as hopeful as Orsini² and whose reports had been written in a corresponding tone, was quite dumbfounded by the turn which the Emperor had given to the incident of Piacenza. He now tried to raise difficulties for the Emperor in the matter of the dispensation.³

Rome was given over to astonishment, confusion,⁴ and alarm. The agitation was all the greater since Cardinal del Monte early in the autumn had announced that he had come on traces of a conspiracy in Bologna to hand over that city to the Emperor.⁵ The irritability of Paul III.

¹ The "Risposta data da S. M. al vesc. di Fano" is presented badly and with incorrect date in Lett. d. princ., III. (1577), 185^b *seq.* (*cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. II, c. 3; MAURENBRECHER, 211 *seq.*).

² See the Avisi of May 25, 1549 (not 1548), in MOLINI, II., 427.

³ See MAURENBRECHER, 209; RIBIER, II., 216; DRUFFEL, I., 272.

⁴ Bertano's letter to Cardinal Farnese, dat. Brussels, June 23, 1549, announcing that all his exertions had been in vain, was brought by G. Orsini on July 5 (see Nunz. di Francia, I., A, f. 419^b). The Emperor's reply of June 12 was handed to Paul III. on July 18 (*ibid.*, f. 409, Secret Archives of the Vatican); *cf.* Corp. dipl. Port., VI., 320 *seq.*

⁵ *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. II, c. 3; DRUFFEL, I., 208; DE LEVA, V., 35. See also Legaz. di Serristori, 202.

was stimulated by incitements on the part of France,¹ and the provoking behaviour of Mendoza, who, on presenting the tributes from the kingdom of Naples to the Pope, made a public display of his contempt.² Although the spoken language of the Pontiff at this time was not kept under much restraint, yet his written reply, sent on June the 25th, to the Emperor's declaration on the subject of Piacenza was full of moderation. He would gladly have abstained from replying, if he could have done so without injury to the Holy See and himself; being forced to take the opposite course, he would not revert to the shameful proceedings in Piacenza or to the Emperor's promises, but confine himself to the instructions given to Martin Alfonso da Rio. According to the representations of Bertano and Orsini the Emperor wished, for the pacifying of his own conscience, to be made acquainted with the legal claims of the Holy See; the Pope therefore had been willing to enter into negotiations, but only on the condition of previous restitution; finally, however, in order not to appear suspicious or harsh, he had given way and laid before Mendoza the original documents. Mendoza had not been able to make any objections to them. The Emperor, on the contrary, now asserts that the Holy See has no legitimate title to possession, and offers Ottavio a compensation of 40,000 ducats, on condition that he, the Emperor, is also made master of Parma. Whether such conditions are acceptable, or whether they are hurtful to the Holy See and even Christendom itself, may be left to the judgment of God and of mankind. He only prays that the Emperor will consult the will of God and his own conscience afresh, in order that he may perceive that Piacenza belongs to

¹ See DRUFFEL, I., 270, and also *Histor. Zeitschrift*, XXXII., 419.

² Cf. Buonanni's *report of June 29, 1549 (State Archives, Florence), App. 38, and that of M. Dandolo of June 29, 1549 (State Archives, Venice).

the Holy See and that his Majesty, for many reasons, has no right to stay its re-delivery; the same reasons hold good in respect of Parma.¹

The relations between the Pope and the Emperor having become disturbed once more, it was only natural that France should make every attempt to secure the upper hand in Rome. The policy of that kingdom was directed to the formation in the Pope's mind of a favourable opinion of the Catholic sentiments of Henry II. and the prevention of any concessions to the Emperor on questions of religion. On the 13th of July 1549 Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, brother of the Duke of Ferrara, appeared in Rome on a mission from the French King and was received with the highest marks of respect. He was to replace du Bellay, whose performance of his duties had not given satisfaction in Paris. Once more the project of a Franco-Papal alliance was ardently discussed.²

Olivier, the chancellor of Henry II., soon discerned, however, that the policy of Paul III. did not go beyond the acquisition of some amount of importance³ in the eyes of the Emperor through the negotiations with France. Mendoza

¹ The "Risposta data a M. Alonso de ordine de N. S." is in Lett. d. princ., III. (1577), 186. DRUFFEL (I., 266) gives it again, although he must have inferred that it had been printed from PALLAVICINI (l. II, c. 3), whom he himself cites as evidence for the date. The date is also certified by the copy in Cod. Urb., 1512, f. 93-97, and Cod. Barb., LVIII., 30, of Vatican Library. For Bertano's further ineffectual negotiations over Piacenza, see his *reports of Oct. 3, 22, 24, and Nov. 3, 1549 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See RIBIER, II., 222 *seq.*, 230 *seq.*, 234 *seq.*, 243 *seq.*; DE LEVA, V., 26 *seqq.* On July 19, 1549, Scipione Gabrielli *reported: "Il Papa è stato 3 o 4 giorni in castello, cosa contra la sua usanza in questi tempi, et ogni giorno fanno consiglio così in castello come in casa del rev. Farnese" (State Archives, Siena).

³ RIBIER, II., 236 *seq.*

also was not deceived. He was firmly convinced that the Pope did not trust the French, and would not break with Charles V.¹ At first, certainly, it seemed as if a rupture over the Council was imminent between the Emperor and the Pope. Paul III. wished to remove the existing antagonism by summoning the universal episcopate to Rome to discuss the reform of the Church. As the Emperor could not openly oppose a proposal originally put forward by himself, he now tried to nullify it by suggesting impossible conditions. He demanded, firstly, that the system of reform to be proceeded with at Rome must not collide with the ordinances of the Interim and the recommendations for the improvement of the clergy made to the German princes at the Diet of Augsburg; secondly, that a Papal declaration should be made that the Tridentine prelates came to Rome simply as ordinary bishops and not as fathers of a General Council; this latter demand contained in it the tacit acknowledgment that the translation of the Council had been invalid. The Pope hoped to find a way out in the fact that he had not invited the Tridentine bishops to Rome expressly for the consideration of Church reform, and further that not all but only some had been summoned for that purpose. Such invitations were sent on the 18th of July to Cardinal Pacheco, Bishop of Jaen, Pietro Tagliavia, Archbishop of Palermo, Francesco Navarro, Bishop of Badajoz, and Giambernardo Diaz, Bishop of Calahorra. In order that it might be more clearly understood that the prelates were bidden only as individuals, summonses were sent also to four of the bishops at Bologna.²

¹ See DRUFFEL, I., 271 *seq.*, 274; *cf.* *Histor. Zeitschrift*, XXXII., 419.

² *Letter of Cardinal Farnese to Bertano, dat. 1549, July 27 (*Inf. polit.*, XIX., 211^b-212^b, Royal Library, Berlin); PALLAVICINI, I. II, c. 4; MAURENBRECHER, 133*; DE LEVA, V., 50 *seq.*

The briefs, which were sent to each bishop by a special messenger, declared that the urgent needs of the Church called for special consultations and measures which could not be adequately provided for by the Pope and the Sacred College alone. His Holiness had therefore determined to take the opinion of a portion of the episcopate and commanded them, in virtue of their pledges of holy obedience, to present themselves before him within forty days.

The bishops at Bologna at once declared their readiness to answer the call of their supreme head. Not so those of Trent. The reply in which they tendered their excuses for remaining where they were was dictated by Charles V., who thought that by inviting four bishops from Trent Paul III. intended to put a stop to the assembly in that city.¹ As the Pope expressed himself satisfied with their apologies, the Emperor threatened Bertano that he would address an appeal to a council and bring on a schism.²

In order to steer clear of this extremity Paul III. yielded so far to the Emperor's objections to the Council of Bologna as to communicate to Cardinal del Monte on the 13th of September his orders to dismiss the bishops there assembled, which were carried out on the 17th. On the 26th of September briefs were sent to the bishops who had left Bologna in which the Pope exhorted them to keep in readiness to resume the work of reform at the first call from him.³

The disobedience of the Tridentine prelates had not been taken calmly by Paul III.⁴ On the 18th of September

¹ See PALLAVICINI, l. II, c. 4; CAMPANA, 519.

² Cf. Charles V.'s letter to Mendoza of Aug. 18, 1549, in DRUFFEL, I., 278.

³ See PALLAVICINI, l. II, c. 4; Massarelli, *Diarium IV.*, ed. MERKLE, I., 864.

⁴ See the interesting *report of Serristori of Sept. 2, 1549 (State Archives, Florence).

they received a "Monitorium" rejecting their excuses. The Bishops of Badajoz and Calahorra, on the receipt of this brief, declared that they would obey the Pope. This was excessively disagreeable to the Imperialists. Granvelle ordered Mendoza to influence his Holiness "to pacify the consciences of the two prelates"; if this attempt was unsuccessful, he must raise a protest. Paul III. warded off this danger by declaring by word of mouth that the bishops who did not appear would incur no censures.¹

To all the cares and excitements of these last months others undreamed of by the Pope were added about this time.

While the negotiations for an alliance with France were under consideration, a vital condition had been laid down, that Parma must be abandoned by Ottavio Farnese, son-in-law of the Emperor, in order that this city, so important on account of its situation, might be given to Orazio Farnese, the betrothed husband of Diana of Poitiers, natural daughter of Henry II.² In March 1548 it was thought in Rome that Ottavio, just made Gonfaloniere of the Church, would hand over Parma to his brother.³ But herein popular surmise was entirely mistaken. Subsequently the most varied schemes were considered as to what was to be done should such an occurrence take place, especially as to the manner of compensating Ottavio.⁴ Paul III. at last decided on a plan which put the Emperor in the dilemma of also refusing to the Holy See what

¹ See besides DRUFFEL, I., 289, 293, and CAMPANA, 520, the *report of Uberto Strozzi of Oct. 26, 1549' (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² The marriage treaty was already completed (see RIBIER, II., 129 *seq.*).

³ See Nuntiaturberichte, X., 275, n. 1.

⁴ Cf. Legaz. di Serristori, 202 *seq.*

he had stubbornly refused to his own son-in-law: Parma and Piacenza were to be given back to the Church, and Ottavio compensated by Camerino and a sum of money. The Imperialists, Margaret, Ottavio, and Cardinal Farnese sought in vain to dissuade the Pope. The orders were issued to Camillo Orsini to take possession of Parma in the name of the Holy See.¹

Ottavio, whose temper was as fiery as his father's, was not, however, inclined to make place for his brother. Parma seemed to him too precious a possession—precious, moreover, on this account, that he believed himself to be held in great affection by the citizens.² Ever since the beginning of 1549 he had stood in intimate relationship with the viceroy, Ferrante Gonzaga, as he wished by all the means in his power to retain possession of his principality. Goaded on by Mendoza, Ottavio determined at last upon an act of desperation. On the 20th of October 1549 he left Rome secretly and hastened to Parma. There he attempted to obtain admission, first as lord of the place, and, when that plea failed, as vicegerent in the name of the Holy See. This Camillo Orsini refused before receiving direct authorization from the Pope.³

Paul III. was beside himself on hearing of Ottavio's departure. His anger was intensified by the general belief that at bottom he was in sympathy with Ottavio's proceeding, who had always been his special favourite.⁴

¹ See Dandolo, *Relazione* in ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 341; PALLAVICINI, I. 11, c. 6; DE LEVA, V., 56.

² See *Legaz. di Serristori*, 202.

³ See PALLAVICINI, I. 21, c. 6; MAURENBRECHER, 214; DE LEVA, V., 56.

⁴ See BROSCH in the *Mitteil. des österr. Instituts*, XXIII., 151. Ottavio had already been described in a *letter of G. M. della Porta of Dec. 14, 1537 (State Archives, Florence), as "idolo" of Paul III.

Such a sympathy, however, was imaginary. On the contrary, the Pope wrote to Camillo Orsini forbidding him to countenance Ottavio's conduct. To the latter he sent by special messenger sometimes verbal, sometimes written, commands to return to Rome there and then. The Duke, far from obeying, had no scruple in appealing to Ferrante Gonzaga, the mortal enemy of his house, for aid. Gonzaga declared his willingness to furnish him with support upon condition that Ottavio would satisfy himself with a compensation for Parma or at least hold the duchy as a fief from the Emperor. Ottavio thereupon wrote to Cardinal Farnese that he would consent to Ferrante's conditions if the Pope did not immediately surrender to him the city.¹

On the 5th of November, two days after he had kept the anniversary of his coronation,² Paul III. received authentic tidings of the disobedience and ungrateful conduct of his pampered grandson. On the following day he went, regardless of the intense cold, to the villa on the Quirinal which once had belonged to Cardinal Oliviero Carafa, where Cardinal Farnese read to him the letter from Ottavio. The Pope's indignation knew no bounds, and waxed greater when he perceived that the Cardinal was on the side of the rebel. He was attacked by a violent fever accompanied by a chill;³ together with the agitation of the preceding days, this illness broke down the old man of eighty-two, who up

¹ PALAVICINI, I. 11, c. 6; RIBIER, II., 247; DRUFFEL, I., 294; Lett. di B. CAVALCANTI, xv *seqq.*; Miscell. d. stor. Ital., XVII., 126 *seq.*; GUALANO, 89; DE LEVA, V., 56 *seq.*; Carte Strozzi, I., 1, 431.

² RIBIER, II., 251 *seq.*

³ Cf. M. Dandolo's despatch in DE LEVA, V., 59; the report of d'Urfé in RIBIER, II., 252 *seq.*; that of Lasso in DRUFFEL, I., 294; that of Scipione Gabrielli of Nov. 7, 1549 (State Archives, Siena), and that of U. Strozzi (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) of Nov. 7 in Appendix No. 39; see also MERKLE, I., 873; II., 3, 491.

to that time had enjoyed an enviable vitality. Cardinal Farnese on the 7th of November ordered the castle of St. Angelo to be occupied by Astorre Baglioni and the gates of Rome to be closed.¹ On the 9th the Pope's condition was hopeless. His mind was unclouded, and he once more summoned the Cardinals round his bed. It was expected that he would appoint two Cardinals reserved *in petto*, but he did not. Paul III. only commended the affairs of the Church, and the interests of his beloved family,² in a few words to the Cardinals. If his inordinate family affection is taken into consideration, there is nothing incredible in the report that, at his last hour, on the 8th of November, during a brief rally, he dictated a brief ordering Camillo Orsini to deliver Parma to Ottavio as soon as the tidings of his death arrived.³ This order to a certainty was given by Cardinal Farnese to Camillo Orsini on November the 8th, 1549.⁴

On the 9th of November Paul III. made his confession

¹ *"Che non entra nè esce un uccello," writes B. Ruggieri on Nov. 7, 1549 (State Archives, Modena). See also Scipione Gabrielli's *report of Nov. 7, 1549 (State Archives, Siena).

² See d' Urfé's report and that of Cardinal Ippolito d' Este of Nov. 9, 1549, in DRUFFEL, I., 294 *seq.* ("le card. de Ghity" is not, as Druffel supposes, Gaddi, but Chieti=Carafa); *cf.* also the *letter of B. Ruggieri of Nov. 9, 1549 (State Archives, Modena), and *that of F. Franchino of Nov. 9, 1549 (State Archives, Parma), who *inter alia* relates: "S. B. ancora sta in se e parla con sentimento e particolarmente ha dette a Madama et al s. Don Alessandro parole benigne et amorevoli, che havrebbe fatto scoppiar a pianger li sassi."

³ *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, I. II, c. 6, n. 3; Carte Strozzi, I., I, 432; BROSCHE, I., 188; RACHFAHL, 20; MERKLE, II., 16.

⁴ See the letter in Appendix No. 40 (Altieri Library, Rome). A. Elio, Bishop of Pola, brought the letter on Nov. 11 to C. Orsini, who did not acknowledge it, since it came from Cardinal Farnese (see GUALANO, 90); he joined Ottavio on Nov. 14, 1549 (see Arch. Trent., II., 61).

and received the viaticum devoutly; towards evening there was a decided change for the worse,¹ and in the early morning of the 10th he expired.²

No one doubted that the ungrateful conduct of Ottavio was the immediate cause of death.³ The Venetian ambassador, dwelling on this circumstance, remarked: "Pope Paul was good-hearted, obliging, intelligent, thoughtful. No man was ever more worthy to be called magnanimous."⁴ Nepotism, his besetting fault, he acknowledged himself, and in his last hours he repeated to himself the words of the Psalm, "My sin is ever before me." "If they had not had the mastery over me, then should I have been without great offence."⁵

The Pope's body was brought without delay to the Vatican,⁶ and placed in a temporary tomb in St. Peter's, behind the organ. Out of regard for the merits of the deceased Pontiff, the College of Cardinals, on the 13th of November, voted out of the treasure in St. Angelo a sum of 10,000 ducats, to be deposited with a bank, in order to erect a worthy monument in St. Peter's under the

¹ See Scipione Gabrielli's *report of Nov. 9, 1549 (State Archives, Siena).

² See Massarelli, *Diarium* IV. (ed. MERKLE, I., 873): "hora 14"; Lud. Bondini de Branchis Firmani, *Diarium* (*ibid.*, II., 491): "hora 13½." Ruggieri says, in his *letter of Nov. 10, Paul III. died "fra le 13 e 14 hore" (State Archives, Siena); Masius: "two hours before day" (LACOMBLET, *Archiv*, VI., 146); Cardinal Farnese in the *letter to C. Orsini of Nov. 10: "sul far del giorno" (Altièri Library, Rome). For the place of Paul III.'s death, see also the evidence in DENGEL, *Der Palazzo di Venezia*, 108, n. 4.

³ See B. Ruggieri's report of Nov. 16, 1549 (State Archives, Modena).

⁴ ALBÈRI, 2nd Series, III., 343.

⁵ See RAYNALDUS, 1549, n. 49; CIACONIUS, III., 553.

⁶ See B. Ruggieri's *report of Nov. 10, 1549 (State Archives Modena); *cf.* MERKLE, II., 4, 491.

supervision of the Farnesi.¹ Cardinal Farnese committed the task to the Milanese sculptor Guglielmo della Porta. Although begun in 1550, the monument was not finished until 1576. The artist originally had intended that the principal decoration should consist of figures of the four seasons, but, on the advice of Annibale Caro, for these were substituted statues of Justice, Wisdom, Prosperity, and Peace. The monument was erected near the altar of St. Longinus; thence it was removed in 1628 by Urban VIII. and placed in the left niche of the principal tribune.²

Above a white marble sarcophagus rises the bronze effigy of the Pope, seated on a throne. He is represented as a venerable old man bent beneath the burden of years. He is clothed in mantle and pallium. Absorbed in meditation, the intellectual head, with its deep-set eyes, hollow cheeks, and ample beard, is bowed with calm dignity. With his right hand, as if slowly raised, he gives the Papal blessing. The sides of the sarcophagus are adorned with two masks and two *amorette* in bronze. On the black tablet of inscription run the words in classic conciseness: "Paulo III. Farnesio Pont. Opt. Max." The Farnese lilies and other adornments have been introduced, but not a single religious symbol is visible. The base is of dark, coloured marble; above it, on volutes, lie the allegorical marble figures of Wisdom and Justice. The former, a matron, with serious even virile features, holds in the right hand a mirror, in the left a book. While this form recalls a Sibyl by Michael Angelo, the traits of Justice resemble rather the sensuous beauty of some

¹ See Massarelli, *Diarium* V, ed. MERKLE, II., 12.

² See A. CARO, *Lett. fam.*, II., Padova, 1763, 3; VASARI, VII., 225, 546; *Mél. d'Archéol.*, IX., 57 *seq.* Cf. ZANETTI, *Monete d' Italia*, 179; LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 249; THODE, V., 235 *seqq.*

figure by Titian; originally this statue was nude, but in 1595 was covered with bronze drapery by order of Cardinal Edoardo Farnese, who wished to avoid the offence which might be caused by the exhibition of an unclothed figure in a Christian temple.¹ The two corresponding images of Peace and Prosperity, for which no room could be found in the niche, are now preserved in the Farnese palace.

This monument, like the character of the Pope whom it commemorates, has had to run the gauntlet of opposing criticism, as the representative of two epochs. If not certainly one of the most beautiful of the Papal monuments in St. Peter's,² this work of Guglielmo della Porta,³ despite the *baroque* taste in its architectural details and a certain affectation in the allegorical figures, is yet a remarkable composition, distinguished by largeness and beauty of design. It is the first instance in Rome of the type created by Michael Angelo in the monuments of the Medici. The great bronze statue of Paul III. is full of dignity and majesty.

¹ See *Mél. d'Archéol.*, IX., 68. Here (p. 64 *seq.*) there is also a refutation of the legend that the statue represents Giulia Farnese (see also CLAUSSE, *Farnèse*, 110; MAURICE PALÉOLOGUE, *Rome*, Paris, 1902, 195 *seq.*). Similar female figures, scantily draped, are still to be seen on the monument of Bona Sforza, erected in 1593 in S. Nicola at Bari.

² Thus GREGOROVIVS (*Grabdenkmäler des Pöpste*, Leipzig, 1857, 148). Winckelmann's severe criticism represents the opposite extreme (*cf.* CANCELLIERI, *Mercato*, 42). For moderns, see BEISSEL in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, XLVI., 495, and especially RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 146 *seq.*

³ The artist's name appears no less than three times on the monument (see FORCELLA, VI., 70).

CHAPTER XII.

THE COMPLETION OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVOLUTION IN ENGLAND AND SCANDINAVIA.—THE PROTESTANT PROPAGANDA IN FRANCE.

ALTHOUGH the diplomatic relations between Henry VIII. and Clement VII. had been broken off in August 1533 and in the beginning of the following year the English schism had taken place under Parliamentary sanction,¹ the King nevertheless maintained an unofficial agent in Rome. The latter, immediately after the election of Paul III., tried to arouse hopes in the Curia that the King might not be indisposed to come to terms with the new Pontiff. The Imperialists saw in this only a manœuvre to gain time by deceiving the Pope for the consolidation of the organized English schism.²

The immediate sequence of events showed that the Imperialists were right. The Parliament, which was opened on the 3rd of November 1534, enacted that the King and his successors should be recognized as the sole supreme head of the English Church and enjoy all the spiritual power and authority involved in that title, even in matters of dogma. This statute, which handed over the whole life of the Church to the secular authority, was supplemented by another declaring that not only all

¹ Cf. our remarks, Vol. X. of this work, 284 *seq.*

² See Letters and Papers: Henry VIII., ed. GAIRDNER, VII., n. 1298, 1397, 1403; *cf.* 1257.

who conspired against the King's person or called him heretical and schismatical, but also all who disallowed him any one of the titles belonging to him, were liable to the penalty of high treason.¹ Since to his previous titles was now also added that of "Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England immediately under God," the "English Pope" was henceforth to hand over every loyal Catholic to the public executioner.

The new Act of Supremacy dropped the clause which had been introduced in 1531 in order to tranquillize Catholic scruples, "that the King was head of the English Church so far as the law of Christ permitted."² It was clear that England was to be torn asunder from the centre of Christian unity. The English clergy and laity were so steeped in confusion of ideas, pusillanimity, human respect, and servility that many did not recognize, or refused to admit that they recognized, this fact. They clung to the ambiguity of the figurative expression Supreme Head, and by means of fanciful explanations shut their eyes to the fact that the ecclesiastical supremacy claimed by Henry VIII. was something entirely new and incompatible with a sincere profession of Catholic faith. Under the terrors of the new statutes the majority of the English clergy acknowledged the King's supremacy and the Vicar-General appointed by him, a layman without the slightest link with the priesthood, the arbitrary and irreligious Thomas Cromwell.³

¹ Statutes of the Realm, III., London, 1817, 26th of Henry VIII., c. 1, 13; LINGARD, VI., 239 *seq.*; SPILLMANN, I., 96 *seq.*

² *Cf.* Vol. X. of this work, 279; BELLESHEIM in *Katholik*, 1890, II., 75 *seq.*; WETZER und WELTE, *Kirchenlex.*, XII., 2nd ed., 1219.

³ *Cf.* BRIDGETT, Fisher, 340 *seq.*, 346 *seq.*; Lett. and Pap., VIII., i; TRÉSAL, 120 *seq.*; Cromwell's character according to MÖLLER-KAWERAU, 205. For the controversy concerning the official separation of the English Church, see *Lit. Rundschau*, 1908, 108 *seq.*

Widespread as was the dissatisfaction at the innovations,¹ yet only a few had the spirit to withstand them openly from the sense of duty. On these few fell the whole weight of the penal laws, the execution of which inaugurated in England a reign of terror bloodier than any which had yet been known within the pale of Christendom. Everyone suspected of denying the royal supremacy could be forced to accept an oath the refusal of which meant for the unhappy victim of tyranny the gibbet or the block.²

The first to lay down their lives, on the 4th of May 1535, were the Priors of the three Carthusian houses in London, a Brigittine monk, and a secular priest. They were hanged, cut down while yet alive, and then disembowelled and quartered. They all died with an intrepidity of soul worthy of the martyrs of the first persecutions.³ The same Christian heroism was evinced by two other victims of the King's supremacy. They were John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and his friend, Thomas More, who, since April the 17th, 1534, had been held prisoners in the Tower. Paul III. attempted to save the Bishop's life by naming him a Cardinal,⁴ but thereby only hastened his end. On the 22nd of June 1535 the grey-headed old man, then in his sixty-seventh year, was brought out dressed only in sorry rags to the scaffold on Tower Hill and there beheaded, his naked body being afterwards exposed to the popu-

¹ Cf. Lett. and Pap., VIII., ii; TRÉSAL, 122.

² A non-Catholic student (HOOK, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, III., London, 1869, 69) speaks of the rule of Henry VIII. as "a despotism under legal forms."

³ Cf. [CHANCAEUS, M.] *Historia aliquot nostri saeculi martyrum, Moguntiae*, 1550, and *Gandavi*, 1608; SPILLMANN, I., 105 *seqq.*; TRÉSAL, 127 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 141.

lace.¹ On the 6th of July he was followed to the same place by Thomas More, once Chancellor of England, and renowned throughout Europe for his learning. Both Fisher and More declared before execution that they died in the Catholic faith and as loyal subjects of the King. The heads of both of these heroes were set up on London Bridge.²

Europe rang with grief and indignation on hearing of these judicial murders. Nowhere was the excitement greater than in Rome; Paul III., with characteristic caution, despite the pressure on the part of the Imperialists, had acted hitherto with restraint towards Henry VIII., especially as the French diplomatists had dazzled him with the prospect of a near reaction in that monarch's views and promised to do all that lay in their power in that direction. So strong was his confidence in the influence of Francis I. that he cherished hopes of Fisher's deliverance through French intervention until it was too late.³ When the tidings of his execution came instead on the very morrow, as it were, of his elevation to the purple, the perhaps excessive forbearance of the Pope gave way at last. It was on the 26th of July, when a letter from the French nuncio announced in Rome the death of "the

¹ See BRIDGETT, 302 *seq.*, 381 *seq.*, 409 *seq.*; SPILLMANN, I., 124 *seq.*; *cf.* V. ORTROY in the Anal. Bolland., X. (1891); XII. (1893). For the martyrdom on June 19, 1535, of the Carthusian Newdigate and twelve of his associates, see CAMM, S. Newdigate, London, 1901.

² See RUDHART, Th. Morus, Nürnberg, 1829, 398 *seqq.*; SPILLMANN, I., 144 *seq.*; *cf.* BRIDGETT, Th. More, 2nd ed., London, 1892; BREMOND, Th. More, 2nd ed., Paris, 1906.

³ Besides Lett. and Pap., VIII., n. 713, 746, 786, 812, 837, *cf.* *Min. brev. Arm., 40, t. 51, n. 454; Admirato Franciæ, dat. May 21, 1535; n. 455; Card. de Giuri; n. 456; Episc. Favent.; n. 457; Regi christ. dat. May 21, 1535 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

martyrs of the supremacy.”¹ The Pope’s anger knew no bounds. He at once conveyed the tidings to the Cardinals,² and invoked by briefs on the same day the help of the Christian princes. In these letters he was able with justice to point out that for three long years the Holy See had, with the gentleness of the Good Shepherd, borne with the behaviour of Henry VIII., patiently hoping from day to day that the King would change for the better. As this latest act of wickedness had shown, all such hopes were futile, and the Pope now recognized the necessity of “using the branding iron” and declaring as worthy of deposition the King who for more than two years already had been living under excommunication, as a heretic schismatic, notorious adulterer, open murderer, sacrilegious despoiler, destroyer and transgressor against the majesty of God.³

The Pope was strengthened in this intention still further by the announcement, at the end of July, of the execution of Thomas More.⁴ A month later a solemn Bull was issued in which Henry was urgently implored, after the enumeration of his misdeeds, to repent within three months, but in the case of contumacy the Pope as

¹ So called by DIXON (*History of the Church of England*, I., Lond., 1884, 25); *cf.* also KERKER, I. Fisher, Tübingen, 1860.

² *Hierì il Papa pece legger alcune lettere del nuntio suo di Francia concerning the “tragedia” of Fisher’s death (*letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga to Agnello, dat. Rom., July 27, 1535, Cod. Barb. Lat., 5788, f. 198^b, Vatican Library). G. M. della Porta had already by mistake announced the execution of Fisher in *letters from Rome to Urbino on May 29 and 31, 1535 (State Archives, Florence).

³ See RAYNALDUS, 1535, n. 10-13; *cf.* *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 463 *seq.*, 466 *seq.*; *Lett. and Pap.*, VIII., 24, 1144; *letter of Cardinal E. Gonzaga, dat. July 31, 1535 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), and of F. Peregrino of July 28 and 31, 1535 (*ibid.*).

⁴ See *Lett. d. princ.*, I., 134 *seq.*; *Nuntiaturberichte*, I., 466.

supreme judge of the faithful would apply to him the severest penalties to which, in accordance with the then existing law, those remaining obdurately under the ban of the Church were exposed. He would accordingly be declared deposed, his country laid under interdict, his subjects absolved from their oath of obedience and called upon to make war against the rebel; foreign nations would be forbidden intercourse with the supporters of the schism and be vested with the right to make themselves masters of their persons and their property.¹

The mere threat of these penalties made such an impression in the Low Countries that English trade suffered heavy loss.² It is therefore probable that if Charles V. and Francis I. had made a show of putting the Bull into execution, Henry VIII. would have been compelled, by an insurrection of his subjects,³ to draw back from the schism he had initiated. But it soon became evident that the Pope's appeal for help would die away upon the air. Francis I. expressed the utmost indignation at Henry's deeds of violence, but declared that the first steps must come from Charles, as the person most closely interested; the latter, on the contrary, could not see his way to interfere unless certain of support from King Francis.⁴

Paul III. would have willingly proceeded⁵ without delay,

¹ Bull., VI., 195 *seq.* (in RAYNALDUS, 1535, n. 18, wrongly dated); *cf.* HERGENRÖTHER, Kirche und Staat, 673 *seq.*; Zeitschr. für kath. Theol., 1895, 609 *seq.*

² Nuntiaturberichte, I., 519 *seq.*, 524.

³ See Lett. and Pap., IX., xv.

⁴ *Cf.* Lett. and Pap., IX., xiv. For the anger of Francis I., see the *letter of F. Peregrino of July 28, 1535 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ See the *brief to the "Comes Kildariae in Hibernia" of Aug. 31, 1535, Min. brev. Arm., 40, t. 52, n. 10 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); *cf.* the *report of Sanchez of Aug. 20, 1535 (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

but the attitude both of the French and the Imperialists forced him to hold back the Bull from day to day. Thus precious time was lost, which Henry made use of to consolidate the schism with all the energy, resolution, and ruthlessness of his character.

In addition to this the Sacred College was divided over the form of procedure and the composition of the document. When in a consistory held on the 26th of November 1535 the Bull was at last put to the vote, so many objections to it were made that yet another revision was ordered.¹ Paul III. hoped to arrive at a final decision on the 10th of December. He sent in minutes of his own, but neither of the two drafts, which he presented, met with the approval of the Cardinals. Although the Pope displayed much self-confidence and declared that he wished to surpass the great deeds of Julius II., no one but Schönberg shared his opinion that the publication of the Bull must be proceeded with at once. Unwillingly the Pope dismissed the consistory without a decision having been come to.² It was now thought that the Bull would appear without the Cardinals' consent; but Paul III. shrank from such an unusual step.³

In the beginning of 1536 the document was once more submitted privately to the Cardinals. According to the report of Pedro Ortiz, the Imperialist agent in Rome, it was afterwards produced in consistory on the 11th of January. On the 23rd Ortiz was able to announce that

¹ Cf. F. Peregrino's *report, dat. Rome, Nov. 27, 1535 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² Cf. Cardinal du Bellay's somewhat one-sided report of Dec. 22, 1535, in the Lett. and Pap., IX., n. 1007, and also *ibid.*, n. 944, 983, 999. See also E. Gonzaga's *letter to his mother, dat. Rome, Dec. 10, 1535 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See Lett. and Pap., IX., n. 999, 1024.

the Bull had now received the leaden seals and only awaited printing and fixture in public places.¹ Then at the last moment all was altered by the announcement of the death on the 7th of January of the innocent and defenceless Queen Catherine. Charles V. had no longer any interest in the fate of his unfortunate aunt, and the outbreak of war with France did the rest. Charles and Francis were soon suitors for the support of the powerful King of England. Under such circumstances Paul III. had no other course to follow than to withdraw the Bull.²

Queen Catherine's death was soon followed by that of her rival Anne Boleyn. Accused of the worst unchastity, she was executed on the 19th of May 1536 by order of the uxorious King, who, eleven days later, married Jane Seymour.³

The fall of Anne Boleyn seemed like a divine judgment. It rekindled in Rome the never extinguished hope⁴ that the King, designated by Leo X. as "Defender of the Faith," would, on the removal of the *origo mali*, return and be reconciled to the Church. Paul III. had also himself yielded to this fateful delusion, and declared himself ready to smooth the way for the King's return.⁵

While the fulfilment of his desire seemed as easy as possible to the Pope, he failed to see that in place of Henry's fleeting passion another motive had stepped in, and this a financial one, which raised a permanent obstacle

¹ See GAYANGOS, V., 2, n. 5, 6, II.

² See Lett. and Pap., X., xv.

³ See LINGARD, VI., 263 *seqq.*; BROSCHE, VI., 295 *seqq.*

⁴ Soon after Catherine's death Paul III. renewed his hopes (see F. Peregrino's report of Feb. 12, 1536, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

⁵ See RAYNALDUS, 1536, n. 26; Corp. dipl. Port., III., 307 *seq.*, and the letter of Casale, whose details are quite untrustworthy, in Lett. and Pap., X., n. 877.

to the King's return to the Church.¹ Since February 1535 the dissolution of the English monasteries had been going on with almost unexampled unscrupulousness and barbarity, a measure which reduced the most powerful adherents of the Pope to beggary and brought into the Crown an annual revenue of 32,000 pounds and a sum in hard cash of 100,000 pounds, amounts representing, at the present value of money, 175,000 and 600,000 pounds respectively.²

The King had all the less intention of refraining from this robbery as the Parliament and the higher clergy dared not show any resistance, and the continuance of the war between the Emperor and France left Henry in safety from any attack from without. But at the beginning of October 1536 he was surprised by an uprising in the county of Lincoln. This had scarcely been put down when the much more dangerous revolt known as the "Pilgrimage of Grace" ensued. From the Scottish border to the Humber and the Lune the people rose in anger against the brutal closure of the monasteries as well as against evil social conditions. They demanded the dismissal of the King's bad counsellors and the restoration to the Church of her rights. The "Pilgrims," whose numbers amounted to 40,000, used all their forces of influence to restore the banished religious to their monasteries.³

In Rome, where the hopes of Henry's return were now seen to be groundless,⁴ the news of the Catholic rising in

¹ BROSCHE, V., 304; GASQUET, II., 2nd ed., 4.

² SPILLMANN, I., 172. For particulars, see GASQUET, Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries, 2nd ed., London, 1888; in German, Mainz, 1890-1891, and the new edition in one volume, 1906. See also BAÜMER in the *Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.*, XIII., 461 *seqq.*; WILSON, *Zur Vorgesch. der Auflösung der Klöster in England*, Halle, 1900.

³ LINGARD, VI., 378 *seq.*; BROSCHE, VI., 315 *seq.*

⁴ See Lett. and Pap., XI., n. 230

Northern England was hailed with great joy. It seemed a happy coincidence that at that very moment, the beginning of November 1536, the news was circulated that James V. of Scotland, whom Paul III. had withheld from any alliance with Henry VIII., intended to marry a daughter of Francis I. The Pope recommended this match most warmly, while at the same time warning Francis against any support of Henry VIII.¹ After the conclusion of the wedding, on the 19th of January 1537, he sent the Scottish king the consecrated hat and sword² as encouragement to him to help the English Catholics. Already, on November the 17th, 1536, a letter had been sent to the English people to strengthen them in their attachment to the ancient faith and in their resistance to the tyranny of Henry VIII.³

A short time afterwards Paul III. contemplated a mission which might have been very dangerous to the English King.⁴ Reginald Pole was to go as legate to France and the Netherlands in order to enter into communication therefrom with the defenders of Catholicism in England, and thus force Henry to give up the schism. Charles V. agreed to the scheme, and so also did the French ambassador. Thus on the 15th of February Pole was appointed legate to Francis I. and to the Regent of the Netherlands "for the settlement of the English concerns." As a companion

¹ Cf., besides the letter in RAYNALDUS, 1536, n. 29, also *Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 4, n. 244: *Mag. Franciae, dat. Nov. 7; n. 245: *Regi Scotiae, dat. Nov. 9, 1536 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See RAYNALDUS, 1537, n. 40; BELLESHEIM, Schottland, I., 330.

³ Min. brev., *loc. cit.*, n. 259: *Eccles^{cis} et saecularibus Anglie, dat. 15 Cal. Dec. 1536 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ The French nuncio called Pole's attention to this in a *letter of Nov. 26-29, 1536 (Nunz. di Francia, 2, Secret Archives of the Vatican). Pole's mission was then fixed, according to a *letter of F. Peregrino, dat. Rome, Dec. 22, 1536 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

and adviser he was accompanied by an old politician, Gian Matteo Giberti.¹

Paul III. set great hopes on Pole's mission.² His appointment seemed, in fact, a move in the right direction. The Cardinal had old relations with Henry VIII., who, on receiving his outspoken work on the "Unity of the Church," had invited him to return to England, where he hoped to come to an understanding with him. Although Pole rightly thought this too dangerous a request to comply with, yet no one seemed more fitted than he to influence the King in the direction of peace. On the other hand, Pole as a scion of the house of York might well cause Henry some alarm and be a stimulus to the spirits of the English Catholics. It was believed in Rome that two-thirds of the people of England were against Henry VIII.³ As the French nuncio announced that James V. of Scotland was ready to cross the English border, the most favourable prospect seemed to open of forcing Henry to recant.⁴ The latter therefore viewed Pole's mission with the most anxious apprehension, and determined to use all means, even murder if necessary,⁵ to put the Cardinal out of the way.

¹ Cf. *Acta Consist.*, in BRADY, II., 281, and the numerous briefs of Feb. 15, 1537, in **Min. brev. Arm.*, 41, t. 5, n. 146-168, partly in RAYNALDUS, 1537, n. 38 *seqq.*; see also QUIRINI, *Ep. Poli*, II., 34 *seqq.*; LINGARD, VI., 285 *seq.*; PIEPER, 113 *seq.* For the departure, see Vol. XI. of this work, p. 165, n. 1.

² See G. M. della Porta's report, dat. Rome, Dec. 22, 1536 (State Archives, Florence, Urb.).

³ See G. M. della Porta's *report, dat. Rome, Jan. 5 and 18, 1537 (State Archives, Florence).

⁴ Cf. *Lett. and Pap.*, XII, 1., xxvii.

⁵ Cardinal Carpi *wrote on April 21, 1537, from Amiens: "Sono certificato da Brian, nuovo ambasciatore Anglico et che per esser mignon di quel re, non viene mai qui che per cosa importante molto,

There were various causes of the failure of Pole's mission. In the first place, it came too late, for he did not receive the Legatine Bull until the 31st of March.¹ This delay, and still more the indecision and blind assurance of the "Pilgrims," gave Henry VIII. the time to subdue the northern districts. The whole movement was a demonstration rather than an actual phase of war, and this Rome did not understand.² It was precisely their moderation, the trust that their leaders displayed towards the English Government, which led to the victory of the latter. On the certainty of a general amnesty the insurrectionists laid down their arms, whereupon the King broke his promise and executed cruel vengeance. Another reason for the failure of Pole's mission was the shameful conduct of Francis I., who gave the Legate notice to quit his territories as soon as possible because the King of England desired his surrender as a traitor. Pole had to withdraw to Cambrai, an Imperial city; but even then, in the neighbourhood of Calais, he was not safe, as the English King had set a price of 50,000 crowns upon his head and had demanded his extradition from the Regent of the Netherlands. The town council of Cambrai, alarmed on the score of the trade with England,

era venuto per far l' ultimo conato d' haver nelle mani il signor legato et condurlo in Inghilterra per metterlo nel cathalogo de martyri, et non li essendo reuscito, ne stà desperatissimo et malcontento al possibile di costoro et brava, che se lo trovasse in mezza Francia, lo amazzerà di sua mano con simili altre parolaccie per le quali anchor si vede chiaramente l' animo di quel re et quanto bisogna, che S.S. rev^{ma} si guardi la vita per tutti i versi havendo a far con pazzi et cattivi et che temono più senza alcun dubbio di lei, per quanto ritraggo che d' altra cosa di Roma." Nunz. di Francia, 2, f. 76, Secret Archives of the Vatican.

¹ Lett. and Pap., XII., 1, n. 779. What the hopes cherished in Rome were is shown in the *Nuntiaturberichte*, II., 126.

² DIXON (I., 457) calls special attention to this.

had the Cardinal conveyed to Liège. There he remained, with Giberti, in spite of all dangers, until the month of August, in the hope that he might still be able to do something for his unhappy country. The illusions by which he was still possessed had long since ceased to deceive his colleague Contarini and another observer, whose insight was clearer than his own, Pope Paul III.¹

Although the Pope was now determined to bring the full force of ecclesiastical punishment to bear upon Henry, he yet did nothing precipitately. It was not until, at Nice, he had arranged an armistice between Francis and Charles and had pledged these princes to break off all relations with Henry VIII. after the publication of the Bull, that he revived that document, which had lain dormant for three years, and set about its publication with certain supplementary details. But even then the Pope took no measures until he had laid the matter before a commission of four Cardinals and had obtained their consent.²

In the Bull dated the 17th of December 1538³ the Pope referred to the proofs of his previous long-suffering, which had now been brought to an end by the King's latest acts of iniquity, foremost among which were the cruel executions of prelates and priests and the robbery and desecration of some of the most sacred places in England. It was especially pointed out that Henry, in his infatuated rage, was now wreaking ruin even on the resting-places of the dead, hallowed by the veneration of

¹ Cf. DITTRICH, Contarini, 441 *seq.*; Lett. and Pap., XII., 1, xxxvii; cf. XII., 2, xxx *seq.*

² Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1538, n. 45.; PALLAVICINI, l. 4, c. 7; Nuntiaturberichte, III., 221 *seq.*, 304; Lett. and Pap., XIII., 2, n. 684-686. See also in Vol. XI. of this work, Appendix No. 25, the *letter of Bianchetto to Alexander of Oct. 28, 1538 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Bull., VI., 203-205; cf. Lett. and Pap., XIII., 2, xli.

centuries. As special instances the Pope cited how the convent of St. Augustine, the founder of English Christianity, in Canterbury had been turned by the King into a receptacle for wild beasts and how, not satisfied with that, he had allowed the shrine, blazing with gold and jewels, of Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of the see, to be plundered and utterly destroyed, and even the bones of the saint, venerated for ages by countless pilgrims, to be burned and the ashes scattered to the four winds of heaven.¹

Notwithstanding the assurances given by Charles V. and Francis I. regarding the Bull, no one in Rome placed reliance on either prince.² All the more recognition is due to the self-sacrifice of Cardinal Pole, who even now undertook the difficult task of exhorting them both to be true to their word, heedless of the risks not only to his own life but also to that of his associate, which a mission of this kind involved. At the end of December 1538 he left Rome secretly, as his person was threatened by a plot of English assassins. He hastened to the Emperor at Toledo, but Charles was unwilling to take any definite steps against Henry, and in France, where he stayed for some time with his friend Sadoletto, Pole was quite as unsuccessful. The publication of the Bull was proved to be impossible. Owing to the policy of Charles and Francis, Scotland, where Cardinal Beaton was to have promulgated the Bull, had to remain inactive.³

¹ The destruction was so complete that, at the present day, the position of the shrine is only recognizable by the marks on the pavement made by the knees of innumerable pilgrims.

² See N. Sernini's *letter of Jan. 8, 1538 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ For Pole's second mission, *cf.* QUIRINI, II., cclxix, 142 *seq.*; LINGARD, VI., 318 *seq.*; PIEPER, 117 *seq.*; KERKER, Pole, 55 *seq.*; Nuntiatuerberichte, IV., 36 *seq.*; Lett. and Pap., XIV., i, v *seq.*; ZIMMERMANN, Pole, 164 *seqq.* For the controversy as to the publication of the Bull, see Lingard, VI., 318 n.; DIXON, II., 57; SPILLMANN,

Thus Henry's good luck tided him once more over a very serious danger. If the Emperor and the King had determined to put an embargo on trade, then Henry, as Paul III. calculated correctly, under the pressure of this coalition, which would have been greatly strengthened by a Scottish invasion and the attitude of the disaffected Catholics in England, would have been driven to have made his peace with the Church.¹

Pole's grief at the failure of his mission was intensified by the news of the execution of his relations and the imprisonment of his mother, who, without the evidence of one single witness having been heard against her, was put to death in the Tower on the 27th of May 1541, in the eightieth year of her age, for no other reason than that she was a sincere Catholic and the mother of the Cardinal.²

Thanks to the huge sums which in ten years were gathered in from the confiscated monastic property—nearly sixteen million pounds³ at present-day value—Henry VIII. was able to make the military preparations which were necessary to meet that coalition of Catholic princes of which he stood in constant dread. As time went on, however, it became evident that Rome could hardly expect any more assistance of that sort. The Pope had to satisfy himself with a policy of observation; nevertheless, he did not abandon all hope that some fortunate turn of affairs might bring about a reaction on the part of Henry. Such an opportunity seemed to present itself in the downfall of Cromwell. On the 28th of July 1540 the Vicar-General, to whom every weapon had come handy in the contest with Rome,

I., 143. Cf. also *Nuntiaturberichte*, III., 337, 399, 604; IV., 95; *Lett. and Pap.*, XIV., 2, iii.

¹ Cf. *Lett. and Pap.*, XIV., I, xiii *seq.*

² See SPILLMANN, I., 237 *seq.*

³ See GASQUET, II., 534; SPILLMANN, I., 210.

met the same fate which he had meted out so often to others: death without legal trial. The Legate Cervini was now instructed at once to negotiate with the Emperor concerning Henry's conversion and the restoration of England to Catholicism. Such a change then seemed possible for this reason, that it was reported that Henry had explained the Six Articles of June 1539 in a Catholic sense.¹ Obstacles to the King's reconciliation, however, were not merely his rapacity, love of absolute power, and constant matrimonial entanglements, but also the fact that the higher nobility were interested, as against the Holy See, in participating in the plunder of the monasteries. All prospect of receiving help from the Emperor against England vanished when, on the 11th of February 1543, Charles concluded an alliance against France with Henry VIII.²

This turn of affairs was bound up with the situation in Scotland. King James V. had resisted all the enticements of Henry VIII. to follow him on the way of schism, and, in conjunction with Cardinal David Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, had followed a policy which was summed up in the phrases: maintenance of the ancient Church, subjection of the insubordinate nobles, and alliance with France. The opposition thus caused was rendered still more acute when the Irish, exasperated at Henry's attempts to separate their country from Rome,³ offered the Irish crown to James V. In August 1542 the long-impending war broke out; it ended in disastrous defeat for the Scots, whose nobles played the part of traitors. This catastrophe broke down the King's strength, who soon afterwards died, on the 13th of December 1542, at the age of thirty-one.

¹ Cf. Nuntiaturberichte, V., 305, 311, 320, 345.

² Cf. *supra*, p. 172.

³ Cf. BELLESHEIM, *Irland*, II., 39 *seq.*

Bad times were now in store for Scotland. The nobles, divided into a French and English party, snatched at the supreme power and the Protestant party turned to account the religious troubles of the day. The latter favoured the Earl of Arran, chosen Regent of the kingdom, while Cardinal Beaton was put in prison by his opponents. Under these circumstances Henry VIII. considered the opportunity favourable for annexing¹ Scotland to the House of Tudor by a marriage between his son Edward and Mary daughter of James V.

Paul III. had already, on the 9th of January 1543, addressed a brief to James V. by which he granted him a tax on the incomes of the Scottish Church for the furtherance of the war against Henry, the "Son of Perdition."² He now received the news of James's death, Beaton's imprisonment, and Henry's dangerous schemes, and therefore decided to send to France and Scotland without delay Marco Grimani, Patriarch of Aquileia.³ Grimani was to obtain Beaton's release, to confirm the Scots in their Catholic loyalty, to help in collecting the tenths levied for the war, and to make provision for further help against Henry VIII. He was first of all to consult Francis I. on these plans and to make his appearance in Scotland dependent on the King's judgment, but when there to place himself in communication with Beaton as the first thing and to allay the strife of parties.⁴

¹ Cf. BELLESHEIM, Schottland, I., 337 *seq.*, 343 *seq.*

² RAYNALDUS, 1543, n. 54; BELLESHEIM, I., 341.

³ Cf., besides RAYNALDUS, 1543, n. 55, also *Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 26, n. 192: Card. S. Andreae; n. 193: Regi. Christ.; n. 194: Clero Scotiae; n. 195: Archiepisc. Glasgov.; n. 196: Grimani's pass, all dated March 25, 1543 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ See in Appendix No. 21 the *instruction for Grimani of April 1, 1543 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); see *ibid.*, Arm., 32, t. 34, f. 141⁶

When Grimani entered Scotland in October 1543 he found Cardinal Beaton at liberty and busily engaged in organizing the national and Church party. The Legate, who remained in Scotland till March 1544, was able to present to the Pope the most favourable report of the state of things there prevailing.¹

Paul III., who had been represented as the devil on a medal scurrilously struck by the English King,² supported the Scots in April of the following year in the war against England by sending them 20,000 scudi.³ Cardinal Beaton, who, since the 30th of January 1544 had enjoyed the rank of a Legate, displayed as the champion of a policy of national independence and of loyalty to the ancient faith an activity to which the Pope gave his warm support.⁴ Great then was the latter's sorrow when, on the 29th of May 1546, this eminent man, who had checkmated so adroitly all the schemes of Henry VIII., fell victim to a murderous plot to which the English King was privy.⁵ Naturally the opposing party, which with the help of England was preparing the downfall of Catholicism, lifted

seq.; *Oratio facta p. rev. patr. Grimani, legat. ad Scotos. Cf. *Costituzioni et ordini del rev. patriarcha d' Aquileja nella legat. del regno di Scotia (Communal Library, Ferrara, Cod. 264, N.B., 3 T., f. 290 *seq.*).

¹ See BELLESHEIM, I., 345.

² Aurelio Manni Ugolini in a *letter dat. Rome, June 7, 1544, says that the Pope saw the medal displaying a devil and an inscription in keeping with the figure (State Archives, Siena).

³ Arch. Stor. Ital., 3rd Series, XXVI., 374.

⁴ Cf. *Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 32, n. 222 : Card. Scotiae (April 17, 1545); t. 33, n. 253 : Item (May 1, 1545); t. 34, n. 592 : Archiepisc. Glasgov. (Oct. 12, 1545), Secret Archives of the Vatican; BELLESHEIM, Schottland, I., 345 *seq.*; HERKLESS, Card. Beaton, Edinburgh, 1891, specially pp. 217, 227.

⁵ See BELLESHEIM, I., 351; BROSCHE, VI., 337.

up its head. Victory seemed to smile upon them when, on the 10th of September 1547, the English inflicted a heavy defeat on the Scots. Still, they had not yet carried their whole policy to a successful issue. The Princess Mary was betrothed to the Dauphin, and in August 1548 conveyed to France. From that country such important succour came to Scotland that the English plans of conquest had to be abandoned.¹

Henry VIII., whose last days had been spent under the influence of fear and terror, was by this time no longer among the living. His death, on the 28th of January 1547, once more rekindled the hope in Rome that England might be won back to the Church. Paul III. determined to act at once and address an exhortation to the English Parliament with the request that by reconciliation with the Church they would remove any occasion for attack on England from a foreign enemy² On the 25th of February 1547 he appointed Cardinal Sfondrato Legate to the Emperor and Capodiferro to Francis I., in order to interest these princes in the recovery of England to Catholic unity. The nomination of a third Legate—men's thoughts turned to Pole—was held in reserve.³

The Pope left it to the French ambassador in London to feel the way as to the reception of such an envoy in England. The answer of Somerset, Protector during the minority of Edward VI., was unconditionally negative.⁴ Charles V. declined to interfere in any way in English

¹ See BELLESHEIM, I., 363 *seq.* The letter in which Paul III. exhorted the Scots and Irish to keep the faith is in RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 125 *seq.* *A memorial addressed to Paul III., in 1547, on Scottish affairs is in the State Archives, Naples, C. Farnese, 6.

² The brief, dat. 1547, March 3, is in RAYNALDUS, 1547, n. 123.

³ See PIEPER, 130; Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 492, 494, 499 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. ODET DE SELVE, Corresp. polit., 140; BROSCHE, VI., 389.

affairs,¹ which were now going from bad to worse. Henry VIII. in his attack on the Church had aimed solely at the Pope; ancient doctrines and ceremonies, on the other hand, he wished to preserve, and protected them from the assaults of the reformers by the penalty of death. Nevertheless, the Catholic faith in England was doomed since the bond of Catholic unity had been severed. The Reformation articles of 1536 showed therefore quite consistently an approximation to the Protestant view. At a later date, certainly influenced by the Catholic rising in the north, Henry reverted to his old standpoint of guarding dogma from any material alteration. In 1539 the Six Articles were published. They enjoined, on pain of death, the doctrine of transubstantiation, Masses for the dead, auricular confession, and clerical celibacy. While loyal Catholics were still as liable as before to be hanged and quartered as guilty of high treason, not merely Anabaptists but Lutherans as well were now numbered among the offenders whom the scaffold could claim. The further inroads, however, of Protestant opinions were not to be prevented by measures such as these. It was shown to be impossible, as Marillac had urged in 1540, to fill a whole people with hatred of the Pope without at the same time giving them permission to adopt some of the Lutheran teaching.²

This see-saw of opinions, which could not possibly go

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 363 *seq.*

² See BROSCH, VI., 343; *cf.* RANKE, *Engl. Gesch.*, I, 224, and *Histor. Zeitschr.*, III., 131. For the details of the changes in the policy of Henry VIII., see DIXON, *Hist.*, I, II.; TRÉSAL, 192 *seqq.* Personally, according to POLLARD (*Henry VIII.*, London, 1905, 388), Henry was thoroughly irreligious, the embodiment of Macchiavelli's "Prince" (see also ZIMMERMANN in the *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XIII., 271 *seq.*).

on for ever, was brought to an end under Edward VI.; the logical consequences were drawn from the new system which his deceased father had set up. The Protector Somerset and Cranmer had all the less difficulty in so doing as the supreme head of the Anglican Church was now a boy who had just entered his tenth year and was an irresponsible tool in the hands of the Regent and the Primate. A visitation of all dioceses and the removal of all images was at once ordered. To some of the bishops who had even approved of the breach with Rome, this was going too far. Their opposition, however, was overcome by force. Cranmer, the soul of all innovation, wrought successfully at widening the breach between Rome and England by introducing communion under both kinds, repealing the Six Articles, and constructing a new liturgy. The liturgy of Rome, bound up for more than a thousand years with the national life, secular as well as spiritual, ceased. It was replaced by Cranmer's "Book of Common Prayer," an invention of undeniable skill but untested by any Synod and carried through Parliament by intrigue and force.¹ In spite of the threat of severe penalties, which in the case of repeated disobedience amounted to lifelong imprisonment, serious opposition was shown.² In the summer of 1549 a series of popular risings occurred marked, however, by a social rather than a religious character. They were repressed with bloodshed; nevertheless, it was the opinion of the Venetian ambassador (1551) that the Catholics would again reassert them-

¹ Besides LINGARD (VII., 20 *seq.*), BROSCH (VI., 390 *seq.*), and TRÉSAL (230 *seq.*), *cf.* specially the work of GASQUET-BISHOP, Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer, London, 1890 (*cf.* BELLESHEIM in *Katholik*, 1891, I., 1 *seq.*).

² See POCOCK, *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, London, 1884.

selves if they were to have at their head a competent leader.¹

As in England so in the kingdoms of Northern Europe it was the exercise of monarchical power which carried Protestantism to victory and wrenched powerful nations from the Church to which they owed their culture and civilization.

In Sweden the crisis had been reached under Clement VII. By a *coup d'état* King Gustavus Wasa at the Diet of Vesterås in 1527 tore Sweden from the old religion.² This absolute monarch was also dissatisfied with the new clergy, whom he intended to make use of simply as subservient instruments of his will. The originators of the new movement, Olaf Petersson and Lorenz Andersson, fell into disgrace with Gustavus on account of their opposition to his intended changes in the constitution of the Church, were condemned to death, and only escaped the extreme penalty by paying a large ransom. The Catholic populace saw in this a judgment of God.³ For long there was a widespread aversion to the new doctrines and order, and the excitement rose when the King robbed the treasure which their forefathers had amassed for the uses of the Church and introduced a new liturgy. In 1542 the discontent came to a head in the insurrection of Småland. It soon spread through West and East Gothland as far as Südermania. The peasants declared they would have Christianity re-established, do away with the Mass in Swedish, and bring back again the old order of things. The attention of the rest of Europe, imperfectly

¹ State Pap. Venet., V., 345. That the opposition in England was overborne for want of a good leader is insisted on by H. Tiranno in a *letter of Aug. 3, 1549, written from Rome to the Duchess of Urbino (State Archives, Florence, Urb., 266).

² See Vol. X. of this work, 294 *seq.*

³ See MARTIN, G. Vasa, 475 *seq.*

informed as to the condition of those northern regions, was now aroused.¹ The Swedes expelled from their country the Count Palatine Frederick, son-in-law of the old King Christian; even Charles V. himself entered into negotiations with the insurgent peasantry. Gustavus Wasa succeeded, however, in the following year in quelling the revolt, whereupon fresh spoliation of the Church at once began.² But even then the Catholic remnant was so numerous that the King, at the Diet of Vesterås in 1544, complained of the sympathy shown by the Estates for the old dogma and worship and ordered new changes to be made in the "papistical" residuum.³

¹ Although the spread of heresy in Scandinavia was known in Rome (EHSES, IV., 35) in the autumn of 1536, yet on the 10th September of that year briefs of invitation to the council were sent to the Kings of Denmark and Sweden (*ibid.*, 41). The appellation "Charissime" shows how ill informed the Roman court was in details. In December Faber announced the apostasy of the north to Rome (*ibid.*, 53). In 1537 more was made known by Vorst (*ibid.*, 116; *cf.* p. 144); but a correct copy of the decrees of G. Wasa, of 1527, was not received by the Pope until the summer of 1538 through the conciliar Legates (see *ibid.*, 170, 614). The reports also conveyed by Morone in the beginning of 1537 are characteristic (Nuntiatürberichte, II., 108).

² See GEIJER, II., 91 *seq.*; MARTIN, 469 *seq.* A memorial on the claims of the Count Palatine Frederick to the northern kingdoms, with reference to a restoration of Catholicism, was presented by his orders to Morone in 1537 (Nuntiatürberichte, II., 165 *seq.*). Weeze, in opposition to Cervini, still believed in June 1540 that Frederick, with a subsidy of 100,000 guldens, would undertake a campaign against Denmark by which that country, as well as Norway and Sweden, would be won back to the Church (*ibid.*, V., 503). The exiled Archbishops of Upsala, Johannes and Olaus Magnus, were often supported by Paul III. (see TEGNER, Handskrifna Suecana i italienska arkiv: supplement to Svensk Hist. Tidskr., XII., 1, 43 *seq.*). For both Archbishops, *cf.* MARTIN in Univ. Cath. de Lyon, 1908.

³ See TEGEL, Koning Gustaffs Historie, II., Stockholm, 1622, 201; MARTIN, 482 *seq.*

In Denmark a situation ruinous to the Catholic cause was introduced when, on the death of King Frederick I., the throne was ascended, on the 10th of April 1533, not by his youthful son John, whom the bishops desired, but by Christian III., a prince of Lutheran belief. Scarcely had the question of this succession been settled, after much bloodshed, than the final blow was struck. In August 1536 all the bishops of Denmark were arrested. At the end of October a Diet met at Copenhagen attended only by the nobles, burghers, and peasants; no clergy were present. After a gravamen had been read in which the bishops were represented as the chief instigators of the previous dissensions in the kingdom, the assembly proceeded to pass the resolutions of the King; the imprisoned bishops were deposed; in their place superintendents were appointed as teachers of the new "Evangelium"; the episcopal property passed to the Crown as a source of strength to the latter and for the better defence of the country.¹ A foreigner, John Bugenhagen, who had been called in July 1537 from Wittenberg to Copenhagen, worked with Danish preachers at the construction of a new Church system which abolished low Masses and celibacy but cleverly retained so much of the outward ceremonial that the common people at first hardly perceived that things were not still going on without alteration.

On the 2nd of September 1537 the new ordinance was made known on the sole authority of the King and under appeal to the sword which God had committed to his charge, and of which he would make use against the disobedient and rebellious.² On the same day the superintendents were consecrated in order that the people to

¹ See SCHÄFER, IV., 333 *seq.*, 336 *seq.*

² See ENGELSTOFT, Kirke-Ordinantsens Historie, II., 375 *seq.*; SCHÄFER, IV., 357 *seq.*; Histor. Polit. Bl., CXXV., 384 *seq.*

whom the ancient system was still dear should look upon them as genuine bishops. The imprisoned bishops were set at liberty only on giving a promise to do nothing in opposition to the new ordinance, in exchange for which apostate compliance they were each rewarded with their personal property and a convent.¹ This inglorious end of the Catholic episcopate can be understood when it is borne in mind that all seven bishops as well as the Bishop-coadjutor of Ribe were of noble birth and that four of them had been simoniacally intruded into the episcopal office by the King without consecration or Papal confirmation.²

The people accepted the Lutheran Church constitution with a repugnance which in particular places lasted for more than a century but yet was ineffectual in preventing the gradual extirpation of the Catholic faith. The most tenacious resistance was shown by the inmates of the religious houses, especially by the Mendicants, of whom many were banished and some even hanged. The evil results of the new Church system among the people had to be acknowledged by one of the new superintendents himself, Peter Palladius. The Diet of Copenhagen of 1546 declared all Catholics disqualified for office of any kind, and even deprived of the rights of inheritance. Catholic priests were forbidden, on pain of death, to enter the kingdom.³ Draconian legislation was also carried out in Norway, which in 1536 had been declared a province of Denmark. Yet here, in spite of measures of repression, a century elapsed before the Catholic religion became extinct.

¹ See RÖRDAM, *Mon. hist. dan.*, I., i, 219 *seq.*

² See *Histor. Polit. Bl.*, CVI., 677.

³ Cf. P. PALLADIUS in *Histor. Polit. Bl.*, LXXXI., 91 *seq.*, 275 *seq.*, 280 *seq.*; SCHMITT, P. Heliä, Freiburg, 1893, 160; HOLBERG, *Dänische und norwegische Staatshistorie*, Kopenhagen, 1731, 145 *seq.*

The unworthy Archbishop of Drontheim, who leaned to the Lutheran doctrine, having espoused the party of Christian II., was forced to fly in 1537; of the two Bishops of Norway the one resigned his office voluntarily, the other was removed into captivity. Although robbed in this way of their chief pastors, the people, proudly independent from days of yore, offered a stubborn and protracted resistance in combination with some of the clergy. At last they had to succumb to force. Royal commissioners took possession of the dioceses and plundered and laid bare the churches. Even the stately cathedral of Drontheim was desecrated and turned into a stable for horses. In the noble octagon choir of this edifice was the burial-place of St. Olaf the king († 1030), the founder of the national independence and political unity of Norway. For centuries pilgrims from all parts of Scandinavia had fared to this sacred spot until Drontheim became the Rome of Northern Europe. Now even this royal tomb was not spared. The shrine of the saint, a precious work of art, enriched the coffers of the avaricious King of Denmark with upwards of 6500 ounces of silver.¹

Distant Iceland showed an even sterner opposition than Norway. The Catholic population had there a strong bulwark in Jon Aresson, Bishop of Holar, staunchly true to the Church. To all attempts to introduce the Danish ecclesiastical system he presented a determined resistance. By his side stood Ogmund Paalsson, Bishop of Skalholt, who in his eightieth year was carried away captive to Denmark. His successor, Gisfur Einarsson, was an adherent of the new system. After his death (1548) the Catholics, led by Jon Aresson, made every effort to throw

¹ Cf. SCHÄFER, IV., 430; BAUMGARTNER, *Durch Skandinavien*, Freiburg i Br., 1890, 128 *seq.*

off by force the fetters of the new religion. Paul III. exhorted them to courageous resistance and sent Aresson a magnificent cope which is preserved to this day in the cathedral of Reykjavik. In the struggle now about to begin Aresson was at first the victor, but in 1550 he fell into the hands of a petty chief on the west coast of the island who was of the party of Christian III. He delivered his captive to the Danes, who beheaded him in the sixty-eighth year of his age. Iceland now gradually became a Protestant country, and the treasures of the bishoprics and monasteries were diverted to the Danish exchequer.¹

Together with the sorrow and anxiety felt by Paul III. as he saw the Catholic religion crumbling away in Scandinavia came the apprehension of dangers hanging over a country whose boast it had been for ages to be considered "the eldest daughter of the Church."

The Farnese Pope had only reigned a few months when news reached Rome that the Lutheran heresy was making dangerous inroads in France, and calling for active measures of opposition from Francis I.² To this course he had been challenged by the adherents of Luther themselves, as they had distributed pamphlets on the Mass offensive to Catholics even within the precincts of the palace.³ It was in keeping with the ostentatious manner

¹ Cf. MÜLLER in the *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.*, 1850, 384 *seq.*; SCHÄFER, IV., 435 *seq.* The costly cope of Paul III. is still used once a year at the ordination of Protestant preachers (see *Köln. Volkszeitung*, 1896, No. 211). The brief of Paul III. to the Bishop of Holar of March 8, 1548, "the farewell at the same time of the Papacy to the hitherto Catholic Iceland," in BAUMGARTNER, *Island*, 3rd ed., Freiburg, 1902, 316.

² See F. Peregrino's **report, dat. Rome, Dec. 29. 1534 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ Cf. SOLDAN, I., 143; KAMPSCHULTE, I., 250; DE MEAUX, 23 *seq.*; MARCKS, 279.

in which Francis I. then prosecuted the heretical teachers in his kingdom that his ambassador, in a consistory held on the 29th of January 1535, solemnly declared that the King wished all the world to know that he was a sincere Catholic.¹ It ought not to have escaped Paul III. that some strong political motive underlay the religious zeal of a monarch who, during the pontificate of Clement VII., had played a very ambiguous part in questions of religion. What had then been a matter of surmise was becoming every day more apparent; the King wished to employ the persecution of the Lutherans as a lever wherewith to move the Pope for purely political objects.²

Francis tried to quiet his Protestant friends in Germany with the assurance that he was punishing only people of bad character and instigators of disorder; at the same time he begged them to consider means of arriving at a peaceable settlement of religious affairs.³ Since the spring of

¹ This fact, hitherto unknown and without mention in the *Acta Consist. of the Consistorial Archives of the Vatican, I found in a *report by F. Peregrino of Jan. 30, 1535: "Hierì in consistorio fù adnesso l' ambasciatore Francese, qual in nome del p^{lo} re christ^{mo} fece la sopradicta offerta con dire che a tutto l' mondo S. M^{ta} vol dimostrar che è buono, fidele, devoto et christ^m et non infidele, non heretico ne luterano" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). How the partisans of Francis I. made political capital out of the rise of Protestantism in France, and tried to throw the whole blame on the Emperor is shown from F. Peregrino's **report of Jan. 14, 1535 (*ibid.*). For the Catholic demonstrations of Francis I., see also Hannart's *report to Charles V., dat. Paris, Jan. 31, 1535 (National Archives, Paris, Simancas, K. 1484, n. 20). By a *letter, dat. Terni, Sept. 5, 1535, Paul III. nominated Spiritus Roterus O. Pr. as Inquisitor in Toulouse (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 52, n. 207). The Inquisitor Matthäus Ori was on July 15, 1539, confirmed anew as Inquisitor-General for France (see FONTANA, II., 472).

² Cf. Lett. and Pap., VIII., n. 33. For the King's former attitude, see Vol. X. of this work, 303 *seq.*

³ See FREHER, Script. ed. Struvius, III., 354 *seq.*

1535 the King had actually taken in hand negotiations directed towards the reconciliation of the Protestants with the Church, and Melanchthon on this account had been invited to visit France.¹ The whole proceeding, however, was nothing more than a political manœuvre. The efforts after concord, which harmonized so ill with the persecuting laws just enacted, were only part of the double game in which Francis was engaged: the strengthening of his political connection with the Protestant princes of Germany and the withdrawal of the Pope from his political neutrality. The latter seems at that time to have had a momentary belief that by means of irenic negotiations the religious conflict might be quelled and Melanchthon won back to the Church.² It was soon to appear how visionary all this was. The ecclesiastical policy of the French King was of such a kind that already in April 1535 the gravest fears had been awakened in the Pope and Cardinals that the enthusiastic zeal displayed by Francis would cool down to the opposite extreme.³ As a matter of fact, an edict of July 1535 inaugurated the persecution of the Protestants.⁴

¹ Cf. *Zeitschr. für histor. Theol.*, XX., 25 *seqq.*; BOURRILLY, Guillaume du Bellay, Paris, 1904, 130 *seqq.*

² See CARDAUNS, Karl V., 157 *seq.*

³ Sanchez *reported on April 6, 1535, to Ferdinand I.: The announcement from Lyon on February the 16th that the French King demanded a third of the income of the small benefices, and a half of that of the greater, had caused great indignation in the Pope and the Cardinals, despite the reassuring declaration of the monarch: "immo ingens suspitio invasit paulatim Gallum posthac processurum in apertum Lutherismum et jam ipsum consensisse clam cum Anglo" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

⁴ See DE MÈAUX, 25. The letter from Paul III. to Francis, mentioned in the "Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris" (p. p. LALANNE, 458), telling the King that he might show favour to the heretics, has not yet been discovered, and would seem to be of doubtful authenticity.

After the war with Charles V. had broken out in 1536 Francis I. was again busy with overtures to the Protestant princes of Germany, but now they stood aloof from him. In France itself, in the meantime, the legislation of 1535 was having a terrorizing effect. The Protestants kept silence or fled the country; many conformed outwardly to Catholicism and were attacked by the thorough-going of the sect as "Facing both ways," or "Nicodemites." Even the highly cultivated Margaret of Navarre wore her Catholic mask so well that no less a personage than Paul III. congratulated her on the 9th of January 1537 on her religious zeal and exhorted her to urge her brother to emulate her in this respect.¹

The Catholics always found consistent support from the Sorbonne. This was all the more important since the attitude of Francis towards the religious questions of his kingdom was entirely conditioned by political considerations. It was only to draw the Pope closer to him that he published the Edict of Fontainebleau on the 1st of June 1540, the effect of which was to renew the persecution of the Protestants.

Political aims were again the leading motive when, a few weeks after the declaration of war against the Emperor, Francis I. insisted on the Parliaments taking

¹ The brief of Jan. 9, 1537, in FONTANA, Renata, III., 372 *seq.* For Margaret's correspondence with the Pope, see P. DE NOLHAC, *Lettres de la Reine de Navarre au Pape Paul III.*, Paris, 1887 (*Nozze-Publication*), and *Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, LXVIII., 320 *seq.* They furnish no conclusions as to the Queen's catholicity, nor can any be drawn from her participation in Catholic worship and sacraments. Her religious ideas are still involved in obscurity, even after the inquiries of LEFRANC (*Marg. de Navarre et le platonisme*, Paris, 1899; *cf.* also *Deutsche Lit.-Zeitung*, 1899, 787 *seq.*) and COURTEAULT (*Marg. de Navarre: Revue du Béarn*, 1904); they were certainly very far from orthodox; in secret she was a patroness of the new doctrines.

immediate measures against all who showed themselves disobedient to the Church. This, indeed, did not prevent the King from offering, two months later, to enter into alliance with the Schmalkaldic princes.¹ The next year (1542) shows the King again as the persecutor of French heretics and at the same time the friend of the Protestant chiefs of Germany. Even when the peace of Crespy forced Francis, certainly for a short time only, to make common cause openly with Charles V. against the German Lutherans, he was still keeping up in secret his old alliance with the Emperor's opponents.² In glaring contrast to the latter policy was the sanguinary persecution in 1545 of the Waldensians of Provence, who, by their provocative behaviour, had done much to draw down their punishment. Even Sadoletto, otherwise the advocate of clemency, thought their chastisement just.³

of Jacopo
Sadoletto

The severity dealt out to the French Protestants, everywhere indeed, but with especial rigour by the Parliament of Rouen, failed to check the spread of error, for the source of the apostasy from Rome, ecclesiastical corruption, had not been removed—nay, had only been strengthened by the King by means of the concordat.⁴ The Venetian ambassador Marino Cavalli remarks in his report of 1546 that all the burnings of heretics throughout France had done nothing to check Protestantism: whole towns such as Caen, Poitiers, La Rochelle and many in Provence were silently united in living after the Protestant fashion.⁵

¹ See SOLDAN, I., 173 *seq.*, 179 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 189 *seq.*

³ Cf. DESJARDINS, III., 157, 159; MANENTE, 282; DE MEAUX, 29 *seq.*; ARNAUD, *Hist. des Protestants de Provence*, I., Paris, 1884; RONCHINI, *Lett. del Card. Sadoletto*, Modena, 1872, 122 *seq.*

⁴ These matters will be discussed later on in their proper context.

⁵ ALBÈRI, 1st Series, I., 227; cf. also MARCKS, 280 *seq.*, and St. Mauris' report in DRUFFEL, Karl V., III., 259.

This development made wide advances under the successor of Francis, Henry II. (1547-1559), although the persecution of the Protestants continued.¹ An entirely new and stronger stamp of character was impressed on French Protestantism by an erudite scholar of Picardy, John Calvin, who had fled to Basel at the end of 1534 and had dedicated to Francis I., two years later, his *Handbook of Christian Doctrine*. This work, which was at the same time a defence of his oppressed co-religionists in France, contained the programme of his life—a life devoted to unrelenting warfare with the Catholic Church and the Papacy.² Since the autumn of 1541 Calvin had laboured with iron consistency and grim strength of purpose to put this programme into execution in the city of Geneva. From this centre the influence of this extraordinary man radiated not merely over men of Latin or German race but over the Slavonic populations. France, the Netherlands, Hungary and Poland became the soil from which the Calvinistic propaganda reaped fertile harvests.

¹ See SOLDAN, I., 221 *seqq.*; WEISS, *La Chambre Ardente*, Paris, 1889; MARCKS, 306 *seq.*

² See KAMPSCHULTE, I., 255. Calvin's doctrine and its conquests in European thought will be considered in a future volume.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PROTESTANT PROPAGANDA IN POLAND AND ITALY.—
FOUNDATION OF THE ROMAN INQUISITION.—THE POPE'S
SUPPORT OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS OUTSIDE EUROPE, AND HIS
ACTIVITY IN OTHER SPHERES OF WORK.

IN the kingdom of Poland Lutheran teaching had expanded in ever-widening circles, although King Sigismund I. and many Polish bishops as well had, since 1520, been taking energetic measures to check the advance. The proximity of the apostate Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, Albert of Brandenburg, and the active intercourse with Germany had exercised a strong influence in the direction of Protestantism. In order to grapple with the evil at its roots the King in 1534 forbade his subjects to study at the University of Wittenberg.¹ Paul III. repeatedly commended Sigismund's firmness of action; he seems indeed to have flattered himself that the suppression of heresy in Poland was an accomplished fact.² But this was far from being the case. The prohibition to visit Wittenberg was disregarded by the Polish nobles, while the ordinances of 1535 and the edict of 1541, which threatened

¹ Cf. *Hist. Jahrb.*, XV., 377 *seq.*; FRIESE, II., i, 36, 53 *seq.*; KRASINSKI, 45 *seq.*; EICHHORN, I., 58 *seq.*

² See RAYNALDUS, 1535, n. 29; 1536, n. 41; 1537, n. 45. For Sigismund's oath of obedience on July 4, 1537, see KORZENIOWSKI, 92; *ibid.*, 93, on the financial support of the King by Paul III. In 1538 the Pope tried to gain Poland for the Turkish League (see *Nuntiaturberichte*, II., 283, 279 *seq.*).

with loss of nobility anyone who harboured a heretical priest, remained dead letters.¹ There were, moreover, encroachments of the temporal power upon the Church which called forth repeated admonitions from the Pope both to the King and to the bishops.²

A principal cause of the failure of all the efforts to expel heresy from Poland was to be found in the condition of the clergy. In that kingdom just as in Germany the higher ecclesiastical posts had become the appanage of the nobility without the moral obligations attaching to their possession being taken into consideration. Another factor was the influence of the ambitious Queen Bona, who for years had insisted on inspecting the letters despatched from the Royal chancery to Rome in the fear lest the vice-chancellor Maciejowski might obtain from the King nominations to bishoprics of which she did not approve.³ No wonder that nominees thus appointed showed themselves feeble supporters of the Church and exhibited a laxity towards the fanatics of Protestantism which filled serious Catholics with deep anxiety.⁴ Such was the situation when Sigismund died on the 8th of April 1548 and was succeeded by his son, Sigismund Augustus.

Already in November 1536 a Roman envoy sent to influence the heir-apparent in feelings of persistent loyalty to Catholicism had reported that the prince was showing an inclination towards Lutheranism.⁵ In order to steady him

¹ See THEINER, *Mon. Pol.*, II., 257; KRASINSKI, 53.

² RAYNALDUS, 1542, n. 48 *seq.*; 1543, n. 56.

³ Cf. EICHHORN, I., 75 *seq.*; DEMBINSKI, 9; WETZER und WELTE, *Kirchenlex.*, III., 2nd ed., 762; *Archiv für Ref.-Gesch.*, III., 107.

⁴ See Hosius's cry of despair in his letter to Dantiscus of Feb. 6, 1548, in HIPLER, I., 251. Cf. also the complaint of Bishop Dzierzgowski of 1545 in EHRENBERG, *Urkunden der Provinz Posen* (1892).

⁵ EHSES, IV., 50; cf. *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 254.

Paul III. sent him in 1539 the consecrated hat and sword¹ through Girolamo Rorario. Regardless of this mark of distinction, Sigismund Augustus, who since 1544 had, as Prince of Lithuania, attained a very independent position, manifested a growing sympathy with the new teaching. In 1547 he appointed as court preachers two men who were at that time publicly expounding the Lutheran doctrine of justification. It is not surprising, therefore, that on his accession to the throne the Protestant party looked forward with certainty to his complete separation from Rome.² They were, however, deceived; the new King solemnly promised obedience to the Pope, and the Protestant preachers disappeared.³ This change of position was not due to the exhortations of the nuncio Martinengo but to the political situation which compelled Sigismund Augustus to turn to the bishops for support.⁴ The character of the King, however, was so irresolute and unstable that the fate of the Church in Poland would have become almost hopeless had not at this very juncture a man been sent in the person of Stanislaus Hosius, just appointed Bishop of Ermeland, who, defying all the storms of hostility, played the part of saviour with a force which seemed almost more than human.⁵

Nothing shows more forcibly the strength of the move-

¹ See KORZENIOWSKI, 96; RAYNALDUS, 1539, n. 29; Nuntiaturberichte, IV., 526; PIEPER, 134 *seq.* Cf. *infra*, p. 597, n. 2.

² See Archiv für Ref.-Gesch., IV., 329 *seq.*

³ See *ibid.*, 334 *seq.*; for the oath of obedience, see CIAMPI, II., 28 *seq.*; KORZENIOWSKI, 103.

⁴ Cf. Archiv für Ref.-Gesch., IV., 336 *seq.* For the mission of Martinengo, see RAYNALDUS, 1548, n. 81 *seq.* The *Instruttione for Martinengo, dat. Rome, July 15, 1548, in Cod. Ottob., 2716, f. 82 *seq.*, Urb., 865, f. 320 *seq.*, of the Vatican Library, and MS. Berzosa, n. 2062, in Archives of Simancas.

⁵ EICHHORN, I., 57.

ment of secession, which shook the Catholic Church to the foundations, than the fact that the impact was felt in Italy itself. The Protestant propaganda certainly encountered here, late and early, its greatest obstacles;¹ but so woeful in many ways was the condition of the Church that in numerous quarters only too favourable a reception was given to the missionaries of error. This was specially the case in northern Italy, where intercourse with Germany and Switzerland was incessant. Not merely in Venice, where the staple trade in books was carried on with Germany, but in various towns in the territory of the Republic, Protestantism found a conspicuous foothold in the days of Paul III. as well as in those of his predecessor. While the Venetian Government, from mercantile considerations, allowed a considerable amount of latitude to prevail in the capital, they were much stricter in other towns.

Thus in 1535 in Vicenza a German named Sigismund was handed over, with the Doge's consent, to the Bishop's vicar for punishment on a charge of Lutheran heresy. Paul III. without delay expressed his acknowledgment of this proceeding in a special letter.² The Pope in like manner was active in taking measures against certain heretical teachers, many of whom came from religious orders, who had made their appearance at that time not merely in Piedmont and Lombardy but also in Ferrara and Siena.³ In Ferrara the Duchess Renée, a

¹ See our arguments, Vol. XI. of this work, 511 *seq.*

² See FONTANA, Documenti, 145 *seq.*; BENRATH, Venedig, 30.

³ RAYNALDUS, 1536, n. 45; FONTANA, 146, 149, 151 *seq.*, 155. Here also belongs the letter, overlooked by Fontana, to "Hieron. de Taurino O. Pr., inquisit. in princ. Pedemontano" (Facultas inquirendi contra fratres sui ord. [despite their privileges] et absolvendi poenitentes haeres. abjuraturos), dat. Jan. 19, 1535, Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 50, n. 264 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

woman of high culture and daughter of Louis XII. of France, gave for a while some support and protection to Protestant refugees such as Clement Marot and Calvin, but concealed her real opinions so cleverly that even Paul III. was deceived.¹

If Paul III. showed himself severe towards the contumacious, he was lenient towards those whose recantation of error was sincere.² He often showed greater clemency than the Inquisitors, as in the pardon of a Benedictine who sought reconciliation in 1538.³ But neither clemency nor severity availed much; the religious ferment went on. In the towns of northern Italy especially the difficult questions of grace and free will were expounded from the pulpit and elsewhere in a manner which only left the

¹ FONTANA'S attempt (*Renata di Francia*, I., II., Rome, 1888-1893) to establish Renée's orthodoxy (II., 450) must give way under criticism (*Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, XXV., 425 *seq.*; *Civ. Catt.*, 1900, I., 721 *seq.*; *cf.* HERZOG'S *Realencyklopädie*, XIV., 3rd ed., 658 *seq.*; see also RODOCANACHI, *Renée de France*, Paris, 1896; *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, VIII., 101 *seq.*; XV., 510 *seq.*). How greatly deceived Paul. III had been doing his stay in Ferrara on the subject of this princess's orthodoxy is shown by his brief of July 5, 1543, safeguarding her from the Inquisition (see FONTANA, II., 184, 490; RODOCANACHI, 164 *seq.*).

² *Cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1535, n. 28; 1538, n. 43; FONTANA, *Documenti*, 361 *seq.*; HEFELE-HERGENRÖTHER, IX., 900. The Franciscan, Bart. Fonzio, who came to Rome with a safe-conduct in 1536 (FONTANA, *Docum.*, 146), succeeded in justifying himself so completely that he even obtained an ecclesiastical post; yet Fonzio did not alter his opinions (see HERZOG, *Realencyklopädie*, IX., 3rd ed., 529; *cf.* TACCHI VENTURI, I., 505 *seqq.*).

³ *Alphonso de Vives, O.S.B., dat. in domo s. crucis extra mur. Nic., Maii 29, 1538. After he had been deprived of his preaching faculties by the Inquisition, and sentenced to two years' imprisonment with recantation, the Pope absolved him on his recantation and cancelled the sentence. *Min. brev. Arm.*, 41, t. 10, n. 393 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

hearers in a whirl of doubt and uncertainty.¹ This happened oftener as the Council had not as yet made any pronouncement of doctrine. Generally speaking, however, only particular tenets of Protestantism were adopted in Italy, and for the most part without thought of the logical conclusions which were deducible from them.²

As the governments of Italy had no intention of giving countenance to a religious revolution and the great bulk of the population held fast to the faith of their fathers, the dissentients from the teaching of the Church were obliged to take refuge in subterfuges and disguises.³ The surreptitious character of the Protestant propaganda made it a difficult object of attack, while the faith ran all the greater danger of contamination. The Order of the Augustinian Hermits, from which Luther had emerged, contained many dangerous elements. The manner in which members of that body handled in the pulpit the topics of justification, free will, and predestination gave widespread offence.⁴ Paul III. addressed on the 6th of April 1539 an exhortation to the General Chapter to extirpate "the Lutheran malady" which was bringing the Order into disrepute.⁵ In June 1539 the Pope was also obliged to proceed against a member of the young Order of Capuchins for preaching heresy in Lucca. At the same

¹ See DITTRICH, Contarini, 482.

² Cf. CUCCOLI, 72 *seq.*

³ Cf. TACCHI VENTURI, I., 334 *seq.*, 336 *seq.*, 340 *seq.*; CUCCOLI, 80.

⁴ Cf. Aleander's **letter to G. Bianchetti, dat. Vicenza, July 22, 1538 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ *Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 13, n. 343 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Cf. the *Registr. fr. erem. s. Aug., XVIII., 246 *seq.*, in General Archives of the Augustinian Order, Rome; *ibid.*, XVIII., 176 *seq.*, the **sentence upon Nicolas Veronens., of June 22, 1540. In May 1543 the General Chapter passed **ordinances against Lutherans in the Order (see *ibid.*, XX., 64 *seq.*).

time Cardinal Grimani was given full powers against heretics who had been discovered in Aquileia, Ceneda, and Concordia. In July 1540 the Bishop of Venosa was instructed to take steps against a Minorite for attacking the indulgence bestowed on contributors to the building fund of St. Peter's.¹

The principal danger seemed as before to emanate from Venetian territory, especially from Vicenza, where the Pope, in November 1540, forbade all disputations on predestination and free will; but disquieting reports came also from Milan, and even from Bologna and Florence.² The danger was further magnified by rumour; the German Protestants made frequent boasts of their successes in Italy, and Wauchope reported on the 19th of November 1540 from Worms to the Pope that the German reformers bragged of having 30,000 adherents in Italy.³ This was a gross exaggeration: only in a few places did their errors penetrate wide circles of the people; in general the votaries of innovation were persons of education and humanistic culture, and members of the religious orders who had broken their vows. It was not until the beginning of the fortieth year of the century that, in Lucca and Modena, and, to a certain extent, in Siena,⁴ any considerable number of the population were infected.

It is always a most serious danger for the Church when erroneous opinions, under the guise of strivings after a

¹ See FONTANA, Docum., 370, 374, 377.

² *Ibid.*, 378, 380, 382; MORAN, Spicil., I., 21. Cf. WINKELMANN, II., 2, 627; BATTISTELLA, S. Offizio in Bologna, II *seq.*, 24. For Bishop Vida's proceedings in Alba, see Arch. Stor. Lomb., I. (1894), 26.

³ MORAN, Spicil., I., 20.

⁴ Cf. P. PICCOLOMINI, Docum. Vatic. sull'eresia in Siena durante il sec. XVI., Siena, 1908, 7 *seq.* Further communications on this subject are to be published by P. Piccolomini from the State Archives of Siena.

higher level of piety, are secretly disseminated without the knowledge of the ecclesiastical authorities. This was pre-eminently the case in Naples. The central figure in the movement was a stranger, who drew round him a large circle of friends who became the recipients of teaching the dangers of which did not cross their minds. This was the Castilian, Juan Valdes, a twin brother of the humanist Alfonso Valdes, who in September 1526 had composed the Imperial state documents directed against Clement VII. in language generally associated with the disciples of Luther.¹ Juan had also in his dialogue, *Mercury and Charon*, which appeared simultaneously with his brother's anti-Papal diatribe *Lactantius*, taken part in polemics which were essentially political. Nevertheless, when Clement VII. and Charles V. were at peace again Juan was made a Papal chamberlain. At the end of 1532 or the beginning of 1533 he betook himself to Naples where, with the exception of a visit to Rome, he remained up to his death in 1541, in outward communion with the Church.²

In Naples Juan Valdes who, like his brother, was an enthusiastic admirer of Erasmus, devoted himself to æsthetic and theological studies as well as to social intercourse with his friends. A spiritual address, a Spanish translation of the Psalter and portions of the New Testament, and lastly some edifying meditations were the fruits of his pen. In these writings echoes of Lutheran teaching were already recognizable. They became more distinct in a

¹ See our remarks, Vol. IX. of this work, 354.

² Cf. BOEHMER, *Bibl. Wiffen.*, I., Argentorati, 1874; MENÉNDEZ PELAYO, *Heterod. esp.* 2, Madrid, 1880; Arch. Stor. Napolit., XXVIII., 151; SCHLATTER, *Die Brüder Valdes*, Basel, 1901; further literature in HERZOG, *Realencyklopädie*, XX., 3rd ed., 380 *seq.*, and in *Studi Storici*, IX., 506; see also TACCHI VENTURI, I., 322 *seqq.*, whose opinion of Valdes is more unfavourable than my own.

treatise, *On the Benefit of Christ*, first circulated in manuscript and afterwards put through the press in 1542 and 1543, which had been composed by one of his pupils, Benedetto da Mantua, an Augustinian of the convent of S. Severino, and revised for purposes of style by Marcantonio Flaminio.¹

Like so many others, Valdes does not seem to have realized that the doctrine here unfolded came very close to the Lutheran thesis of justification by faith. A lay theologian, wanting in clearness of thought, he inclined to a vague emotional religion compounded of intellectuality and a false mysticism.² He, like the majority of his adherents, who were known³ in Naples as the "Spirituali," had no deliberate intention of abandoning the Church. Their number was very considerable.⁴ The

¹ Trattato utilissimo del beneficio di Gesù Cristo crocifisso verso i Cristiani, Venezia, 1542 and 1543, new edition by BABINGTON, London, 1855; this was for long erroneously attributed to A. Paleario, who wrote a similar work (*cf.* DE LEVA, III., 369 n.). As to its true author there can be, according to the Compendium Inquisit. (Arch. d. Soc. Rom., III., 272), the less doubt since in the trial of Carnesecchi (ed. MANZONI, 1870: Miscell. d. Stor. Ital., X., 539) the same statement is found (*cf.* BENRATH in the Riv. Crist., IV., 3 *seq.* *Cf. ibid.*, 90 *seq.*, DE LEVA; see also REUSCH, I., 383 *seq.*; HERZOG, Realencykl., IX.,³ 524, 542). For the content, see CANTÙ, I., 380 *seq.*; HEFNER in the work (p. 182 *seq.*), quoted *supra*, p. 429, n. 2, and CUCCOLI, 96 *seq.*; see here (pp. 80 *seq.*, 95 *seq.*) for the religious position of M. A. Flaminio. See, moreover, Vol. XI. of this work, p. 485, note 1.

² See PLÜLF in Wetzler und Welte, Kirchenlex., XII.,² 537, and, independently of him, CUCCOLI, 84 *seqq.*

³ See AMABILE, Il s. Offizio di Inquisizione in Napoli, I., 162, 168, 187.

⁴ The 3000 of the Compend. Inquisit. are naturally a great exaggeration. It is a gross error of RANKE (Päpste, I.,⁶ 93) to understand thereby 3000 "school-pupils" (*cf.* AMABILE, I., 164; TACCHI VENTURI, I., 343).

emotional religion of Valdes, which had for its background the smiling shores of the Bay of Naples, attracted, by the very nature of things, many sentimental women, some of whom were persons of genuine piety. His circle included some of the noblest and most distinguished women in Naples. Vittoria Colonna was one of them, so also the Duchess of Amalfi, Isabella Manriquez, the sister of the Spanish Grand Inquisitor, and, most noticeable of all, Giulia Gonzaga, reputed to be the most beautiful woman in Italy.¹ While the latter as well as Isabella Manriquez fell under the spell of the new doctrine, Vittoria Colonna soon retraced her steps to the right way.

How dangerous the opinions of Valdes were—their erroneous character having first been perceived by the Theatines²—is shown by the circumstance that his two most gifted disciples, Pietro Martire Vermigli and Bernardino Ochino, were precisely those whose careers ended in total rupture with the Church. Ochino's disastrous fall has been already described.³ It remains to be said that this event formed the critical turning-point in the movement of Catholic reform in Italy at which the minds of men decided finally for one side or the other.

Pietro Martire Vermigli,⁴ born in Florence in 1500, entered, while he was yet but sixteen, against the will of his parents, the Augustinian convent at Fiesole. He was

¹ Cf. AMABILE, I., 151 *seq.*; the monograph of AMANTE (Bologna, 1896) and of BENRATH (Halle, 1900). For Giulia's portrait, see *Zeitschr. für bildende Kunst*, N.F., XVIII., 29 *seq.*

² Cf. the evidence of Castaldo in G. A. GALANTE, *De' vani sforz. fatti da' Protestanti per introdurre in Napoli la riforma nel sec. xvi*, Napoli, 1872, 12 *seq.*

³ See Vol. XI. of this work, pp. 488 *seqq.*

⁴ Cf. SCHMIDT, P. M. Vermigli, Elberfeld, 1858; CANTÙ, *Eretici*, II., 69 *seqq.*; WETZER und WELTE, *Kirchenlex.*, XII.,² 789 *seq.*

sent to the University of Padua as a promising youth, and from 1525 onwards he was employed as a Lenten preacher. As such Vermigli worked earnestly and with profit to his hearers. He addressed large congregations in Brescia, Mantua, Bergamo, Pisa, Venice, and also Rome. Afterwards Abbot at Spoleto, he finally became Prior of the convent of S. Pietro "ad aram" in Naples. Vermigli was here fated to enter the circle of Valdes, become the friend of Ochino, and make acquaintance with the writings of the Germans. This resulted in the adoption of dangerous opinions which were soon introduced into his sermons. At first this was done only tentatively, in conformity with his cautious character; but the vigilant Theatines were on the watch, and induced the viceroy to prohibit him from preaching. Vermigli, however, succeeded, through Cardinal Contarini, who had been won over to his side by Marcantonio Flaminio, in destroying all suspicion and having the prohibition removed.¹

In 1541 Vermigli was visitor of his Order in Italy. As such he came to Lucca, where he was chosen Prior of S. Frediano in the middle of the same year.² In a surprisingly short space of time he had gained the affection of all the community; the Lucchesi came in swarms to hear him preach, and the great basilica of S. Frediano could hardly hold them. Then a band of enthusiastic disciples soon rallied round the Prior, whose learning equalled his eloquence. The closer Vermigli came to know Lucca the clearer it became to him that here was a favourable soil on which to sow his new seed. The mercantile traffic with Germany had brought Lutheranism within the ken of many of the citizens, and there were not a few of the clergy, especially in the religious

¹ Cf. LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 301.

² See BONGI, *Invent. d. arch. d. Lucca*, I., Lucca, 1872, 352.

Orders, who had become infected with Protestant opinions. The Archbishop, moreover, was absent, and the authorities, when not more or less secretly inclined to favour the new doctrines, were lax and inattentive; already, indeed, the strict laws with regard to Lent and the observance of saints' days had been abolished, and the participation of the magistrates in public worship suspended.¹ All this encouraged Vermigli, in his sermons and in other ways, to push his erroneous opinions more and more to the front, to imbue his novices with the same spirit, and even in S. Frediano to exhort the communicants to look upon the Blessed Sacrament as merely a memorial of the Passion of Christ. In spite of all Vermigli's caution it was impossible to conceal such conduct from his superiors and the Curia. By April 1542 he was already in fear of official measures against him; these he tried to circumvent by obtaining from the Senate a letter of commendation to his superior. What the effect of his Lenten sermons had been it was hardly possible to say, but it was hoped that so excellent a man would be permitted to deliver them for yet a long time to come.²

In the meantime Cardinal Guidiccioni in Rome had been informed by the Vicar-General of the true state of things. The Cardinal thereupon wrote on June the 28th, 1542, to the authorities of his native city reproving them for their negligence and exhorting them to take proceedings.³

The Lucchesi did all they could to appease the Pope and the Cardinal. They sent a special embassy with the

¹ See *loc. cit.*, 352 *seq.*

² Cf. SFORZA, Nikolaus V. (German trans. by HORAK, Innsbruck, 1887), 143, 276 *seq.*; BENINCASA, Guidiccioni, 101 *seq.*; SCHWEITZER. Guidiccioni, 195; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XIV., 50 *seq.*

³ Cf. BONGI, *loc. cit.*, 353; SCHWEITZER, 196.

assurance of their constant fidelity to the ancient faith and to the Holy See,¹ while to one of Vermigli's chief followers, Celio Secondo Curione, they counselled flight, an intimation which was followed.² In July 1542 measures were taken with regard to forbidden books, and the Church festivals, which had been abolished, were restored. Vermigli was invited to appear before the Chapter of the Order in Genoa, but, never a man of particular courage, he resolved to fly at once, and on the 12th of August he went to Florence, where he met Ochino, whom he prevailed upon to leave Italy without delay.³ Vermigli found an appointment as professor of Hebrew in Strasburg, while Ochino turned to Geneva, where the cautious Calvin had a long and searching colloquy with the refugee before he gave him permission to preach to the colony of Italians in the city.

Ochino immediately threw himself into literary work on behalf of a Protestant propaganda in Italy, against which the combative Dominican, Ambrogio Catarino, took up arms conspicuously.⁴ Ochino left Geneva by 1543, having there married his maidservant,⁵ and then began his years of restless wandering which brought him in 1547 to England. There he wrote his Latin *Tragædia*, soon afterwards translated into English, in which he sought to prove that the

¹ BONGI, *loc. cit.*

² For Curione, see HERZOG, *Realencykl.*, IV.,³ 353 *seq.*; TACCHI VENTURI, I., 308; here also is evidence that Curione's, "Pasquillus ecstasticus," had already appeared in 1543.

³ See BONGI, *loc. cit.*, and Vol. XI. of this work, p. 492.

⁴ Cf. LAUCHERT in the *Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.*, XXXI., 40 *seq.* Luther's Italian opponents are to be made shortly the subject of a special study by Lauchert in the "Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen" of Janssen's History of the German People which he is preparing for publication.

⁵ Cf. *Corp. Ref.*, XLVIII., n. 4146; BENRATH, Ochino, 159 *seq.*

Pope was anti-Christ and introduced the devil as one of the *dramatis personæ*.¹

The flight of two of the most gifted Protestants, Vermigli and Ochino, in search of personal safety, was a loss to the cause in Italy which was felt all the more sensibly as at the same time the Holy See was taking strong measures of defence.² For this there were weighty reasons, as Modena as well as Lucca threatened to fall away. It was a circumstance of fateful importance that at this time the Bishop of Modena, Morone, was kept away on the duties of his nunciature.³ His representative does not seem to have been equal to the task imposed upon him by the seething difficulties of the time.

The spread of Lutheran opinions was no new thing in Modena. When in the Advent of 1537 an Augustinian monk publicly advertised the sale of a heretical work, his conduct only gave rise to a protest. The new opinions gained ground increasingly. Men and women, relates a chronicler, held arguments everywhere on questions of faith and appealed to teachers of the Church whom they had never read and quoted wrongly. Preventive measures were not wanting. The work in question, the *Sommario della Sacra Scrittura*,⁴ was confuted by Ambrogio Catarino and consigned to the flames. A Franciscan conventual, who had attacked the Holy See under a pseudonym, was arrested

¹ Cf. BENRATH, 117 *seq.*

² Cf. BENRATH, Ochino, 137.

³ For the religious troubles in Modena, cf. CANTÙ, II., 148 *seq.*; DITTRICH, Contarini, 803 *seqq.*; CAVAZZUTI, Castelvetro, 43 *seq.* For the Academician, Franciscus Portus, see the Programm von J. STURM, Würzburg, 1902-1903.

⁴ The writing is only a translation of a Dutch work (see Jahrb. für protest. Theolog., VII., 127 *seq.*; VIII., 681 *seq.*; IX., 328 *seq.*; TOORENENBERGEN, Het oudste nederlandsch verboden boek, Leiden, 1882).

and taken to Ferrara, but all this produced little result, and when Morone at last, in the spring of 1542, returned to his diocese, he heard with amazement of the state of things there prevailing. The focus of religious rebellion was a society of learned men, formed sometime about 1536 and known as the "Accademia."¹ Morone had undoubtedly the best will in the world to check the new teaching in his diocese, but his position was a very delicate one, since, like Contarini, he had no very definite standpoint on the question of justification. It was certainly with the best intention that he allowed the work on the *Benefit of Christ* to be published in his diocese and circulated,² little knowing that it contained the starting-point of the very errors which he was now called upon to assail. Morone also hoped to restore order by lenient measures. In agreement with Contarini he resolved to place before the suspects a confession of faith drawn up by Contarini in the simplest form. If it should be thus established that the accused—most of whom were members of the "Accademia"—adhered to the faith of the Church, then, so Morone thought, he could confidently receive them. If the contrary were the case, it was his intention to try and bring them back from their error by gentle measures.³

In the meantime attention had also been drawn in Rome to the affairs of Modena.⁴ Although the gentle Cardinal

¹ Cf. TIRABOSCHI, *Bibl. Mod.*, I., 8 *seq.*; SANDONINI, L. Castelvetro, Bologna, 1882, 155 *seq.*; CAVAZZUTI, 48 *seq.*

² Cf. DÖLLINGER, *Reformation*, III., 312. In the prevailing uncertainty it would have been very useful if A. CATARINO, in his *Compendio d' errori et inganni Luterani* (Romae, 1544), had disclosed the tendency of the work "Del beneficio."

³ DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 806.

⁴ See TACCHI VENTURI, I., 509 *seq.*, 551.

Sadoletto did all he could to protect his fellow-countrymen, Paul III. on the 23rd of June 1542 directed that a brief should be sent to Morone in which he commanded him, taking into consideration the secret and gradual advance of error in Modena, to search out the suspected and bring the guilty to punishment.¹ Morone did not consider it opportune to make use of this document to the letter; it was more congenial to his kind-hearted and tolerant disposition to try to influence the "Academicians" through private negotiations and representations and thus persuade them to renounce their innovations.

Contarini's inexhaustible patience was also shown in his treatment of the heterodox in Bologna, with whom he dealt gently and in a spirit of friendly advice. Morone, who had the support of Sadoletto, succeeded at last in getting forty-one noted citizens and men of learning to sign the declaration composed by Contarini; but this only allayed for a while the religious troubles in Modena.²

The danger which threatened in 1542 of important cities like Lucca and Modena gradually lapsing from the Church, determined Paul III. to take a decisive step by appointing, on the 4th of July 1542, six Cardinals to act as Inquisitors-General.³ He did this on the advice of the

¹ FONTANA, *Docum.*, 388 *seq.*

² See DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 810 *seq.*, 817 *seq.* Cf. SANDONINI, *loc. cit.*, 172 *seq.*; CAVAZZUTI, 51 *seqq.*

³ Cf. the report of Caracciolo in BERNINO, IV., 485 *seq.*, and *supra*, p. 45. On June 28, 1542, Cardinal Guidiccioni wrote to Lucca: "qui è nova per diverse vie quanto siano multiplicati quelli pestiferi errori di questa condannata setta lutherana in la nostra città" (*Arch. Stor. Ital.*, X. [1847], *Docum.*, 163). Already on July 8, N. Sernini could write that in the last consistory (mercordi) "S. S^{ta} disse havero inteso che in Lucca, in Modena et in Parma essersi scoperte sette di Luterani (credo che vi mettese ancora Napoli) et che bisognava rimediarvi. Il card. di Ravenna [Accolti] mi ha detto che questa cura

more rigid party, above all, of Cardinal Carafa and of the Dominican, Juan Alvarez de Toledo, Cardinal of Burgos, and, moreover, of Ignatius of Loyola. After having on the 14th of January cancelled all indults which withdrew clergy and laity from the authority of the Inquisition,¹ Paul III., on July the 21st, issued a Bull by which the whole office of the Inquisition was reconstituted and a central authority for all countries erected in Rome whose energies were to be directed first of all to the suppression of heresy in Lucca.²

In the preamble of this document³ Paul III. insisted on the desire which he had cherished from the beginning of his pontificate, to preserve the purity of the Christian faith by preventing the approach of error, to bring back to the acknowledgment of the truths of the Church those led

s' è data a sei cardinali." The chief danger lay in Lucca (see SOLMI, *Fuga*, 63, 64). On July 10, 1542, Serristori *wrote: "S. S^{ta} . . . ha fatto 4 [sic!] inquisitori sopra questa heresia scopertasi nuovamente in Lucca, i quali sono questi rev^{mi} cioè il Guidiccione, S. Marcello [Laurerio] S. Croce [Cervini] et un altro per levare via tale infectione si quella città, essendo cosa di malissima digestione" (State Archives, Florence). Then followed the appointment of Inquisitors on July 4, 1542, as given in the text.

¹ FONTANA, *Docum.*, 383 *seq.*; *cf.* RIPOLL, IV., 607 *seq.*

² *Cf.* Pole to Contarini, dat. Viterbo, July 18, 1542 (QUIRINI, III., 59 *seq.*; *cf.* BROMATO, II., 60). See also in Appendix No. 16 L. Tolomei's very characteristic letter of Aug. 11, 1542 (State Archives, Siena).

³ Constitution "Licet ab initio" (**Regest. Vat.*, 1695, f. 429 *seq.*; on margin, "Blo. el. Fulgin."; at the end, "A. Barba"), printed in Bull., VI., 344 *seq.*, but not quite correctly (lines 15-16 read "doctorum" for "dictorum"; line 17, "et, si" for "etsi"). The Jesuit J. B. Faure's very rare "Commentarium in bullam Pauli III. Licet ab initio, dat. a. 1542, qua Rom. Inquisit. constituit et ejus regimen non regularibus sed clero saeculari commisit" (1750), was put at last in 1757 on the Index (*cf.* SOMMERVOGEL, III., nova ed., 559). The reduction of the authority of the "secretario intimo" by the "secretario del S. Offitio" is emphasized in the "Informatione" in LAEMMER, *Mon. Vat.*, 464 *seq.*

astray by the deceit of the devil, and so to deal with the obstinate and perverse that their punishment might serve as an example and deterrent to others. Hitherto he had put off any definite measures in these directions as he had hoped that, through the Divine compassion and the efficiency of learned preachers, those in heresy would be brought to see their errors, recant, and return to the Holy Catholic Church; and if they should still hesitate, would, at least, in awe of the authority of the approaching Council, embrace the true faith and return to the path of justice. The Council, however, owing to various reasons, chief among them the war between Christian princes having been unable to make a beginning and the inroads of error in the meanwhile being daily on the increase so that the unity of the Church was more and more impaired by religious discord, he found himself compelled to take measures prohibitive of yet greater evils. Considering that he was beset by claims of the gravest importance and could not therefore give his undivided attention to the matter, the Pope had resolved upon a commission of six Cardinals of approved faith, learning, and virtue.

At the head of the number thus appointed to be "general and most general Inquisitors" were Carafa and Juan Alvarez de Toledo; with them were afterwards associated Cardinals Pier Paolo Parisio, Bartolommeo Guidiccioni, Dionisio Laurerio, and Tommaso Badia.¹

¹ As it was not stated in the constitution that the individual Cardinals should have successors, the temporary character of the institution was thereby implied (see HENNER, *Beiträge zur Organisation und Kompetenz der päpstlichen Ketzergerichte*, Leipzig, 1890, 368). Parisio died in 1545, Laurerio in 1542, Badia in 1547. SILOS (I., 230) names M. Cervini, Sfondrato, and Pio of Carpi as successors (*cf.* MERKLE, I., 816). In a letter of Cardinal Farnese of June 1546 it is stated that the four Inquisitors, Carafa, Juan de Toledo, Cervini, and

The sphere of action assigned to this commission included all Cisalpine and Transalpine Christendom, the whole of Italy, and the Roman Curia itself. The Inquisitors were expressly authorized to delegate in any place their full powers to clerics versed in theology and canon law or to other ecclesiastical dignitaries, and to decide in their own court on any appeals from the ruling of the latter tribunals.

The commission was further empowered to examine, try, and pronounce sentence upon all who had lapsed from the Catholic Faith or were suspected of heresy, with like jurisdiction over the open or secret adherents, patrons, advocates, and advisers. Against all such, in any station in life, the Inquisitors were ordered to proceed, even without the consent of the bishops, and that too in cases where the latter had the right to act.

In the Bull the punishments to be meted out were specified: imprisonment, execution, and confiscation of goods in the case of those condemned to death. In order to carry out these injunctions the commission had the power to appoint the necessary temporal and ecclesiastical authorities, to regulate everything connected with the degradation and surrender to the secular arm of the guilty, even of those possessing the higher orders, and to inflict censures on the contumacious, whereby all appeal to a court of higher instance would be excluded.

Extensive as the powers of the commission of Cardinals were, when directed against obstinate heretics, they yet lacked any jurisdiction over those who sincerely repented of their errors. The Pope reserved to himself expressly the right to confer pardon in such cases.

Sfondrato, met together once every week (see CAMPANA in the *Studii storici*, XVII., 275). It is remarkable that Guidiccioni is not mentioned here.

The essential feature of the new organization thus created by the Bull was its centralization in Rome, whence all appointments by the new authorities now came, and in the plenary powers of taking measures immediately and promptly in all countries and against all persons of whatever rank, independently of the existing ecclesiastical courts.¹ Cardinal Carafa, the chief originator of the new institution, proceeded to put it into working order with fiery enthusiasm. It was reported that, without waiting for a financial grant from the Camera Apostolica, he fitted up a house at his own expense as a place where the Inquisition might hold its sessions.²

Any description or estimate of the work of the re-organized Inquisition as it proceeded under Paul III. is impossible to an historian, as no records are at his disposal. The archives of the Holy Office in Rome must certainly have documentary evidence to some extent, but inspection is absolutely refused.³ If the present congregation of the Holy Office still persists in maintaining a system of absolute secrecy, which has almost universally been abandoned elsewhere, with regard to historical documents now more than three centuries old, it inflicts an injury not merely on the work of the historian but still more upon itself, since it thus perpetuates belief in all

¹ Cf. BROMATO, II., 59 *seq.*

² See Caracciolo in BERNINO, IV., 488.

³ At the end of 1901 I made my first request to be allowed access to the archives of the Roman Inquisition, which was followed by two other applications. The only piece of information I could obtain from the archivist, Fr. G. M. van Rossum, after fourteen months' endeavours, was that the records of the proceedings against heresy under Paul III. had been lost, although the "Decreta" of the Inquisition had been preserved. An inspection of the latter, in spite of solicitations from influential quarters, was absolutely refused me by the Congregation.

and in the worst of all the innumerable charges levelled at the Inquisition.

The want of authentic sources of information is not compensated for by the information of individuals. We know, for example, that Carneseccchi, in 1546, was cited before the Inquisition and acquitted¹ for want of evidence, while other relapsed or obstinate heretics, such as the Spaniard Jayme Enzinas, were handed over for execution to the secular arm.² Of importance is the severe edict issued on the 12th of July 1543 by the Inquisitors-General against the diffusion of heretical books in Rome, Ferrara, and Bologna.³

Without access to the archives of the Holy Office it is impossible to substantiate how far this edict attained its purpose, nor, deprived of the same means of information, can it be known for certain to what extent Cardinal Seripando's judgment was well founded when he said: "At first this Institution was a temperate and lenient tribunal corresponding to the personal character of Paul III., but at a later period, when the Cardinals presiding had increased in number and the jurisdiction of the courts in strength, but above all when the superhuman rigour of Carafa held sway, the Inquisition acquired such a reputation that from no other judgment-seat on earth were more horrible and fearful sentences to be expected, sentences the justice of which cannot be called in question, if they are seasoned

¹ See Arch. d. Soc. Rom., III., 286; *cf.* AGOSTINI, P. Carneseccchi, Firenze, 1899. For Ochino's case, see Vol. XI. of this work, p. 491.

² See ORANO, *Liberi pensatori*, Roma, 1904, XIV.; HERZOG, *Realencykl.*, XVIII.,³ 582; CAMPANA in the *Studi Storici*, XVIII., 282.

³ See BROMATO, II., 80; REUSCH, *Index*, I., 170 *seq.*; HILGERS, 483-486; *cf.* CAMPANA, XVII., 275. For the diffusion in Rome of Lutheran books, see BALUZE, *Miscell.* (ed. Lucca), III., 505; *cf.* CANTÙ, *Eretici*, II., 361.

with that charity which Jesus Christ, appointed by God the Father to be judge of all men, both taught and practised."¹

From the scattered notices that survive we cannot give even a comparatively faithful sketch of the Inquisition in its working under Paul III. In the same way it is impossible to gauge accurately the attitude of the minor Italian States towards the Roman Inquisition. All that is known is that the majority either obeyed or by individual legislation succeeded in warding off excessive interference on the part of the Roman institution.² By an arrangement with the Spanish viceroy, Pedro de Toledo, the Inquisition was reorganized in Naples and was made to depend on that of Rome. The Neapolitans were under the impression that the hated Spanish Inquisition was to be thrust upon them, and therefore showed a violent

¹ DÖLLINGER, *Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trent*, I., Nördlingen, 1876, 7; MERKLE, II., 405. It is evident that, in spite of the Inquisition, many in Rome held secretly to Lutheran doctrine; see F. Archinto's letter of Dec. 25, 1545; see TACCHI VENTURI, I., 328 *seq.*, 519 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 345 n. 3. L. Lippomano's complaint of Nov. 16, 1547, that proceedings against the numerous Lutherans in the Roman States were slack, thereby confirming the previous statements of Seripando. *Cf. ibid.*, p. 335, for Giuliano da Colle, and p. 521 *seq.*, the letter of Cardinal D. de' Durante of Jan. 11, 1546, on the great number of secret heretics in Italy.

² The Sienese envoy L. Tolomei recommended independent action in his letter of Aug. 11, 1542 (State Archives, Siena); see App. 16, also App. 15, letter of Serristori. Although in Lucca on May 12, 1545, a special "Offizio sulla religione" was appointed, heresy continued to spread secretly and not without blame to the government (see BONGI, *Invent. del Arch. di Lucca*, I., 354 *seq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XIV., 59 *seq.*), which at a later period, especially in 1562, took severe measures (see CANTÙ, II., 468 *seq.*; PUCCINELLI, *La Repubblica di Lucca e la repress. dell'eresia nel sec. xvi*, Fossano, 1900). With regard to Ferrara, see FONTANA, II., 250; for Tuscany, CANTÙ, II., 418; REUMONT, I., 129 *seq.*; for Lucca, see also TACCHI VENTURI, I., 528 *seqq.*

opposition; they gained nothing, however, thereby, for Cardinal Carafa, the founder of the Roman institution, was appointed their Archbishop in 1549.¹ In Milan a tribunal was appointed on the Roman model, and from it measures were directed against the Protestants in Locarno.²

The Venetian government was the most difficult to deal with, although Paul III. pointed out that a revolution against the Faith meant a revolution against the State.³ It was not until the whole Venetian territory had become affected by the enterprises of the Protestant party, among whom the Anabaptists had made themselves, from time to time, conspicuous, that the Signoria, upon whom the defeat of the Schmalkaldic League had also made a deep impression, took steps, but not indeed so as to derogate from their functions as a government, to support the Inquisition. A decree of the Doge of the 22nd of April 1547 insisted on the three "Savii sull' eresia" co-operating with the proceedings of the Inquisition. The Council of Ten in the autumn of 1548 ordered the Rectors of Padua, Treviso, Udine, Feltre, Cividale, Capo d'Istria, Adria, Chioggia, Vicenza, Bergamo, and Brescia to take part in the detection and punishment of heresy.⁴ On the 8th of June 1549 Paul III. was able to express his satisfaction that the

¹ See AMABILE, I., 196 *seq.*; BENRATH, Isabella Gonzaga, 80 *seq.* Cf. also Arch. Stor. Napolit., II., 205 *seqq.*; DE LEVA, IV., 341 *seq.*; BALAN, 383 *seq.*; G. DEL GIUDICE, I tumulti del 1547 in Napoli, Napoli, 1893.

² Benrath, Ochino, 205 *seq.*

³ Thus, *e.g.*, in the brief of May 1, 1545, in FONTANA, Docum., 398 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. BENRATH in Herzog's Realencykl., IX.,³ 164, 531; Studien und Kritiken, LVIII., 14 *seq.*; BATTISTELLA, Il S. Offizio in Friuli, Udine, 1895, 48. COMBA gives a list of all the charges of heresy before the Venetian Inquisition since 1541 in the Rev. Crist., III., 28 *seq.*; see also CAMPANA, XVII., 152 *seq.*, 199 *seq.*, 216 *seq.*

government had given assistance to the Papal commissary in Istria towards the suppression of heresy.¹ A few days later, on the 3rd of July, the Pope announced in consistory the deposition of Pietro Paolo Vergerio, Bishop of Capo d' Istria, who had already in May fled from Italy, as the outcome of his trial in Venice for apostasy to Lutheranism. Formerly nuncio in Germany, and there the antagonist of Luther, this ambitious and restless man, with no competent training in theology, had been led by the reading of Lutheran writings to an open rupture with the Church. The keen wit and glowing hate of an apostate were now devoted to the warfare against the Papacy.²

Paul III. continued to be harassed by preachers who, under a semblance of Catholic doctrine, conveyed teaching which was in reality that of Protestants. In 1541 he had already tried to lay an embargo on this mischief by confining the Lenten preaching, in Bologna and Modena, to one church.³ On the 30th of March 1543 he sent letters to the

¹ *Valde gaudemus Deoque et nobis per nobilitates vestras complacitum esse videmus quod brachium et favorem vestrum nostro commissario ad extirpandas in vestra provincia Istriae aereses [sic!] sicut vobis erat dignum tribuistis. Since many still remained obdurate, he exhorted them to bring the matter to an end "sine ullius quidem personae respectu" (Paulus III. duci et senatori Venetiar., dat Romae ap. S. Marc. 1549 Junii 8. Original in State Archives, Venice, Bolle).

² Cf. LAEMMER, Mantissa, 205 seq.; CANTÙ, II., 116 seq.; ASCHBACH, Kirchenlex., IV., 1119 seq.; COMBA, I nostri Protestanti, II.; FERRAI in Arch. Stor. Ital., 1885, and in the Studi storici, Padova, 1892; Arch. Stor. p. Trieste, II., IV.; BENRATH, Venedig, 119 seq.; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXIV., 290 seq., 453; CAMPANA, XVII., 171 seqq., 257 seq.; TACCHI VENTURI, I., 525 seq.; HUBERT, Vergerios publizistische Tätigkeit, Göttingen, 1893; Vergerio is described as "ambitious and untruthful" in the Jahrb. für Gesch. des Protest. in Österreich, XV., 117; cf. also DE LEVA, III., 409; FERRAI, Studi, 90 seq.

³ See LANCELOTTI, VII., 20.

Augustinian Hermits, the Franciscan Conventuals, the Canons Regular of the Lateran, and the Dominicans of the Lombardic and Roman provinces to take measures in their chapters-general to extirpate Lutheran errors, the spread of which in Italy was daily on the increase.¹ In the following year the Benedictines of Monte Cassino were specially exhorted to be very vigilant, lest any taint of error should creep into their sermons or confessionals; the former permission to read Lutheran writings was withdrawn from the whole Congregation.²

All these measures of precaution could not spare the Pope the experience that all over the States of the Church, in Rome as well as elsewhere, the Lutheran heresy was showing signs of existence.³ When the danger was so great it is not surprising that in many places steps were taken from precipitate zeal. That these were little to the liking of Paul III. is evident from an injunction of the 26th of March 1547 to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, as Protector of the Canons of the Lateran, to the effect that he must check any excess of zeal in the detection of errors whereby dissension between members of the community might arise.⁴

¹ See FONTANA, Docum., 390 *seq.*; *cf.* also *ibid.*, 397 *seq.*, 401, 403 *seq.*, 404 *seq.*, 409 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, 394 *seq.*, 396 *seq.*

³ See *ibid.*, 400, 403; TACCHI VENTURI, I, 320, 343, 345, 411; BATTISTELLA, *loc. cit.*, 4, 26, 96 *seq.*, 119, 132. For Lutherans in Faenza, see TACCHI VENTURI, I., 523 *seq.*, and the **facultas absolvendi* issued by the President of the Council, M. Cervini, dat. Bologna, May 11, 1548, Concilio di Trento, 40, f. 50 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ *Brief of March 26, 1547 (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 38, n. 175, Secret Archives of the Vatican). For Cardinal Gonzaga's proceedings against heretics in Mantuan territory, see DAVARI in Arch. Stor. Lomb., XI., 556 *seq.*; LUZIO, V. Colonna, 43 *seq.*

Probably with the Pope's consent, the Venetian nuncio Giovanni della Casa published in 1549 an Index of forbidden books.¹ The Italian Protestants revenged themselves on Paul III. by "an open letter" filled with the most violent personal abuse and ending with a summons to the princes to destroy the "unworthy one." This libel, which in parts was not free from obscenity, was ascribed, but without grounds, by contemporaries to Vergerio or Ochino.²

It is a magnificent feature of the Papal history that the occupants of the Holy See, amid the engrossing claims of the ecclesiastical troubles in Europe, never relaxed their efforts to extend the borders of Christendom in other quarters of the globe.³ Paul III., like his predecessor, honourably fulfilled his duty in this respect, and the missions in Africa, America, and Asia felt his pastoral care.

The Mendicant Orders, who had made mission work a special province of activity, found in the lands thrown open by the new discoveries a widened sphere in which to devote themselves with indefatigable zeal and self-sacrifice, and in this they were firmly supported by Paul III. To

¹ Cf. REUSCH, Index, I., 204 *seq.*; HILGERS, 6. See CAMPANA, XVII., 272 *seq.*

² Cf., besides CANTÙ, II., 61, especially BENRATH, in the Riv. Crist., II., 258 *seq.*, where it is shown that this obscene pasquinade was related to the filthy "Epistola de morte Pauli III. P. M. deque iis quae ei post mortem ejus acciderunt, a. 1549, mense Decemb. in lucem edita." The charges of unbelief and the worst forms of immorality here brought against the Pope are demonstrably false (see ERSCH-GRUBER, XIV., 43).

³ Into the details of the history of missions, for which rich materials are stored in the "Bullaria" and the historians of the different orders, it is impossible here to enter owing to the limits assigned to this work. Unfortunately the history of missions has been to a great extent neglected, and there is urgent need for a Catholic historian to arise who will carry out this task with the assistance of the most authentic sources.

their labours were added, under this Pontiff, those of the Jesuits, a source of inestimable strength.

Paul III. helped on missionary work in three ways. He supported the missionaries themselves, he extended the hierarchy, and he threw into the scales all the weight of his influence with the rulers of the countries to which Christianity was to be brought. What a wide sphere of communication was therein opened up is shown by the fact that he applied personally to the Kings of the Congo and of Æthiopia.¹

In Western Central Africa the kingdom of Congo, on the river of that name, had accepted Christianity even to the reigning house. With the then ruler, King Alfonso, the Pope had at once put himself in communication.² The conversion of those born within the diocese of San Thomé, founded on the 3rd of November 1534,³ was the special object of the Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustinians. In 1548 they were joined by the Jesuits, who at once displayed a far-reaching activity. It was a special source of pleasure to the negroes that the fathers never asked

¹ A Papal *letter to David rex Aethiopiae, dat. Oct. 4, 1540, in Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 19, n. 872 (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Paul III. recommends to him two missionaries sent by him to India. In 1546 King John III. of Portugal reported concerning one Juan Bermudez, who falsely gave himself out to be the Catholic Patriarch of Æthiopia, and begged that a member of the Society of Jesus might assume the Patriarchate (see Mon. Ignat., Ser. I., II., 428 *seq.*), which, however, was not then possible; *cf. supra*, p. 113.

² *Alfonso regi de Congo, dat. March 17, 1535; recommendation of the Bishopric of St. Thomé (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 50, n. 110, Secret Archives of the Vatican). A second letter, with an exhortation to persevere in the introduction of Christianity, dat. May 5, 1535, in RAYNALDUS, 1535, n. 59; *cf. VICOMTE DE PAIVA MANSO*, Hist. do Congo, Lisboa, 1877, 64; Bull. patronat. Portug., I., 164.

³ See Corp. dipl. Port., III., 140 *seq.*; Bull. patronat. Portug., I., 153 *seq.*

for a farthing in return for their toil. The fairest prospects seemed to lie before them; the relations between the King and Paul III. were also friendly. Unfortunately, a reaction set in destructive of their work when the missionaries began to denounce open vices.¹

The principal burden of the vast work of christianizing America was borne under Paul III. as in previous days by the sons of St. Dominic and St. Francis, aided also by Augustinians and those of other Orders. No danger held back these devoted men; a Franciscan, Juan de Padilla, head of the Kansas mission, met his death in 1542 at the hands of savages; he was the first martyr of the faith in North America.²

The successes obtained by the old orders in Central and South America were so great that Paul III. undertook to extend the hierarchy and thereby make possible an organization to meet the needs of the new converts. The consistorial minutes register the creation of many new bishoprics. According to these authentic documents the following sees were founded:—Guatemala on December the 18th, 1534; Antequera, June the 21st, 1535, and Michoacán, August the 18th, 1536, both in Mexico; Cuzco in Peru, January the 8th, 1537; Ciudad Real (Chiapa de los Españoles) in Guatemala on March the 19th, 1539; Ciudad de los Reyes in Peru on May the 13th, 1541; Quito, January the 8th, 1546; Papayán in New Granada, at the foot of the Andes, on August the 22nd, 1546; Rio de la Plata on July the 1st, 1547.³ The Metropolitan of the

¹ Cf. BAESTEN in the Précis hist. Bruxelles, 1892, XLI., 544 *seq.*; XLII., 61 *seq.*, 107 *seq.*

² See BANDELIER, I. de Padilla: American Cath. Quarterly Review, July 1890.

³ See Acta Consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1535, n. 59; 1536, n. 48; 1539, n. 36; 1546, n. 154, 157; 1547, n. 135; Röm. Quartalschr.

American bishoprics had hitherto been the Archbishop of Seville. With his consent and that of the Emperor this connection was dissolved on the 11th of February 1546 and a new arrangement made suitable to the altered circumstances. The sees of Mexico and Lima were raised to the rank of archbishoprics and metropolitan churches as well as that of San Domingo.¹ The first Bishop and Archbishop of Mexico, Juan de Zumárraga, a Franciscan, could boast of belonging to an Order which had converted a million heathens.² On the death of Cardinal Gabriel Merino on the 8th of October 1546 Ferdinand Nimo, Archbishop of Granada in Spain,³ received the title of Patriarch of the West Indies.

In the same year the Jesuits were invited by an old friend of their founder, who lived in Mexico, to come to America. Their numbers did not at that time admit of such a mission,⁴ and it was not until 1549 that the first Jesuits landed on American soil, where so great a career awaited them. Six fathers accompanied the Portuguese fleet bound for Brazil; in the neighbourhood of Villa Vieja arose a new city which afterwards was called San Salvador or Bahia. While soldiers and settlers were occupied on building work, the missionaries erected a church, learned the native language, opened schools for the Indians, and expended untold labour in trying to turn

VI., 229 *seq.*; Records of the Americ. Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, X. (1899), 2 *seqq.* According to Gams, Lima (1539), Paraguay (1547), and Guadalaxara (1548) still belonged to the Metropolitan jurisdiction of Seville.

¹ Cf. RAYNALDUS, 1546, n. 156; Panvinus in PLATINA, Vitae Pontif., Coloniae Agripp., 1626, 382; GAMS, 148, 153, 156; Records, *loc. cit.*, 14.

² Cf. ICAZBALCETA, Juan de Zumarrága, Mexico, 1881.

³ Acta Consist. in the Records, *loc. cit.*, 13 *seq.*

⁴ See Araoz to Ignatius, dat. April 24, 1547, Epist. mixtae, I., 360.

the savage inhabitants from a life of wandering and from cannibalism. By Whitsunday 1549 the first hundred converts were ready to receive baptism, and from 600 to 700 others were under instruction.¹

In the East Indies also Christianity had been introduced by the Portuguese colonists. Here the Gospel was preached by the Dominicans and Franciscans; the seaport town of Goa, on the western coast of Lower India, was the centre of Christian teaching as of the Portuguese possessions. Paul III. carried into effect what Clement VII. had already planned, and on the 3rd of November 1534 he raised Goa into a bishopric which should embrace the vast area from the Cape of Good Hope to the borders of China. On this occasion the Pope confirmed to the Portuguese crown the rights of patronage conferred by his predecessors over this gigantic diocese also, which on the 8th of July 1539 was placed under the jurisdiction of the newly created Archbishopric of Funchal. In return for the rights of patron the King of Portugal undertook to maintain the cathedral of Goa and the ecclesiastical institutions of the diocese, to erect and furnish churches and chapels as necessity arose, and finally to provide in every place a cure of souls.²

Ecclesiastical conditions in Goa as well as the extension

¹ Nobrega to Simon Rodriguez, dat. S. Salvador, 1549, and to Dr. Navarro, dat. *ibid.*, Aug. 10, 1549 (Materias e Actrêgas para a Historia e Geographia do Brasil, publicados por ordem do Ministerio da Hazienda, II., Rio de Janeiro, 1886, 48, 65, 66; POLANCUS, Chronicon, I., n. 493-497; ORLANDINUS, l. 9, n. 85-101; SIMÃO DE VASCONCELLOS, S.J. [† 1671], Cronica da Companhia de Jesu do Estado do Brasil, I., 2nd ed., Lisboa, 1865, 31-37).

² Corp. dipl. Port., III., 151 *seqq.*; MÜLLBAUER, Gesch. der kathol. Missionen in Ostindien, Munich, 1851, 51 *seq.*; see also CONTZEN, Goa im Wandel der Jahrhunderte, Berlin, 1902. The Bull of July 8, 1539, in Bull patronat. Portug., I., 170 *seq.*

of Christianity throughout the Portuguese possessions suffered to an extraordinary degree from the deep moral corruption into which the greater number of Portuguese officials had sunk. These nominal Christians had as much need as the heathen of a thorough conversion, but only a man of exceptional gifts could bring the needed aid. In the spring of 1540 he came in the person of Francis Xavier, sent by Paul III., and with him began a new epoch in the Christian civilization of the East. In the short space of six years he succeeded, by means of an apostolate fired with divine inspiration, in so reorganizing the mission field in India and wherever Portuguese rule extended, that it became the starting-point for a yet wider activity embracing the whole of eastern Asia.¹

Paul III. conferred not merely great services on missionary work but also on civilization by openly protecting the freedom of the American Indians. The Dominicans, with the enthusiastic Bartolomé de las Casas at their head (nominated on the 19th of December 1543 Bishop of Chiapa),² for long waged war with intrepidity and self-devotion against the harsh and cruel tyranny by which the Spanish conquerors bent the American aborigines to their yoke.³ The Bishop of Tlascala brought their complaints to the ears of Paul III., who resolved to make a decisive attack on the system. Two justly celebrated Papal edicts come under consideration. The first, of May the 29th, 1537, was addressed to

¹ DAHLMANN'S opinion (*Indische Fahrten*, I., Freiburg, 1908, 399). Cf. *supra*, p. 115.

² *Acta Consist. in the Records*, *loc. cit.*, 9.

³ See BAUMSTARK, *B. de las Casas*, Freiburg, 1879; HÄBLER, I., 382 *seq.*; WALZ, *B. de las Casas*, Bonn, 1905; MACNUTT, *B. de las Casas*, London, 1909.

the Archbishop of Toledo, Cardinal Juan de Tavera. The Pope here acknowledges that Charles V., by a general law, had forbidden slavery among West or East Indians; he had therefore taken their freedom and their property under his protection even if they were outside the Church. "They must never be extirpated by slavery, but on the contrary by instruction and example be prepared for life eternal." Paul III. finally gave full powers to the Cardinal to protect the Indians to the utmost; everyone was to be forbidden specifically to inflict any kind of slavery on an Indian or to rob him of his goods; the transgressor was to be subject to excommunication irremovable save by the Pope only, except in danger of death and after previous restitution made. The Cardinal, in conclusion, had absolute power given him to take any other measures against the recalcitrant which might seem to him necessary and expedient in accordance with the claims of wisdom, justice, and religion.¹

The second document, of the 2nd of June of the same year, was a Bull addressed to Christendom at large, forbidding absolutely the slavery of all Indians, even of those in regions as yet undiscovered. Here the Pope laid the axe to the root of the tree by combating the asserted incapacity of the Indian to receive Christianity which served as the pretext for their subjection. In noble words he based his condemnation of slavery on the mission of the Church to carry the Christian faith to all the world. From the sentence of the Gospel, "Go and teach all nations," he deduced the right and the duty to make Christian truth accessible to Indians as well as others. Let them be free even if unconverted, and let no one dare

¹ See MARGRAF, 82 *seq.*, 85 *seq.*, 218 *seq.* The minute of the letter (Arm., 41, t. 6, n. 125, Secret Archives of the Vatican) shows some variants and gives as date May 28.

bring them into slavery.¹ If this decision put an end to uncertainty of opinion by the declaration of a fixed rule of action, a long time had yet to elapse before any substantial success was secured. Even in Rome the Pope was unable at once to carry out effectually his efforts against slavery, and the position of captive unbelievers in Italy still continued to be one of bondage.²

There remain to be mentioned some other instances of the Pope's activity in the service of the Church. His interest in the Armenians,³ his communications with the Maronites, whom he sought in every way to strengthen in the Christian faith,⁴ and his conciliatory intervention in

¹ See WADDING, XVI., 417 *seq.*; MARGRAF, 86 *seq.*, 219 *seq.* To this period also belongs the *brief of June 29, 1547, addressed to Charles V., on the subject of the continuance of slavery, which was still justified on the grounds of the heathenism of the natives. The brief prescribes: "quod omnes personae eccl^{ca}e seculares et regulares possint sine conscientiae scrupolo officialibus Imperatoris denunciare injurias illatas Indis, etiamsi ex eo mors subsequatur, non autem revelatus in confessionibus, dummodo non procedatur per viam accusationis." The brief argues that: "Attendentes Indos ipsos licet extra ecclesiae gremium existant, tamen fidei et salutis aeternae capaces esse et propterea non severitate et laboribus pendendos, sed praedicationibus et blandis operibus ad vitam aeternam invitandos et alliciendos." Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 39, n. 554 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See I. GIORGI, Paolo III. è la schiavitù in Roma nel sec. xvi, Roma, 1879; BARTOLOTTI, La schiavitù in Roma, Roma, 1887, 4 *seq.*; RODOCANACHI, Institut, 257; *cf.* especially BRANDI, Il Papato e la schiavitù, Roma, 1903, 21 *seq.*, where the "Bando sopra al tener di li schiavi et schiave in Roma" of Jan. 12, 1549, is placed in a new light by recent archival information.

³ See RAYNALDUS, 1546, n. 157; *cf.* *Acta Consist. of Aug. 21, 1549, Consistorial Archives of the Vatican.

⁴ As by the *brief: Petro patr. Maronit. in Syria, dat. Perugia, Sept. 13, 1535 (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 52, n. 229, Secret Archives of the Vatican). For the state of affairs in 1542 and the mission of an Apostolic visitor, see, besides the briefs given in the Tüb. Theol.

the dispute between Latins and Greeks in Venetian territory.¹ No canonization took place under Paul III., although several processes were commenced² and the public cultus of the Sicilian hermit Guglielmo sanctioned.³ The Pope, who had so often to come forward in defence of the liberty of the Church,⁴ refused steadfastly to comply with the demands of Henry II. of France for an extension of the concordat to Brittany and Provence.⁵

Quartalschr., 1845, 49 *seq.*, also: (1) *the letter of Pietro patriarcha de Maroniti of Feb. 7, 1542, in which he begs the Pope to send a visitor (Lett. d. princ., XIII., 157); (2) *Io. Abdelmem, governor of Monte Libanon, recommended on Feb. 14, 1542, the bearer: "frate Felice de Ventia, proc. di guardiano di Monte Libanon," and besought the Papal blessing (*ibid.*, 160); (3) the Instruction for the visitor of Nov. 20, 1542 (see Appendix No. 20), Secret Archives of the Vatican.

¹ See LE BRET, *Magaz.*, II., 894 *seq.*; *Histor. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 28. A *brief to the Venetian nuncio of June 22, 1549, in favour of the Greeks in Venice, in *Min. brev. Arm.*, 41, t. 45, n. 360 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² 1539: Consistory "de Canonizat. b. Hiacynti" (see KORZENIOWSKI, 96); *brief to Card. Tolet. et Salamant. et episc. Balneoreg. in civit. Salam. commorantib., dat. 1542 (to inquire into the life and miracles of Joh. de Sahagim, ord. eremit. S. Aug.). *Min. brev. Arm.*, 41, t. 25, n. 718 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ NOVAES, VII., 60; *ibid.*, 58 *seq.*, for the "approbatio" of the "Ufficio proprio della spozalizio della Verg. Maria."

⁴ Many examples in the **Min. brev.* of Secret Archives of the Vatican. For Venice, see CAMPANA, 533 *seq.* Paul III. extended the Bull "In Coena Domini" (Bull., VI., 218 *seq.*) to meet a great number of cases in 1536 (see HAUSMANN, *Päpstliche Reservatfälle*, Regensburg, 1868, 96; HILGERS, *Büchverbote in Papstbriefen*, Freiburg, 1907, 18).

⁵ See DRUFFEL, *Beiträge*, I., 107, 112, 192. Charles V., on the contrary, carried through a similar concession (see PHILLIPS-VERING, *Kirchenrecht*, VIII., 1, 201). For the dissolution of the enforced marriage of Jeanne d'Albret, see RICHARD in the *Annal. d. St. Louis*, VIII., 197 *seq.*

The necessary preparations for the General Jubilee occupied the attention of Paul III.,¹ but when the time of celebration came the Pope had already passed away.

¹ See *Acta Consist. of Oct. 25, 1549 (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican), and A. Strozzi's *report of Oct. 26, 1549 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); CIACONIUS, III., 538, 550; THURSTON, *The Holy Year of Jubilee*, London, 1900, 52.

CHAPTER XIV.

PAUL III. AS THE PATRON OF LEARNING AND ART.

I.

ALESSANDRO FARNESE, whose career fell in an epoch of intense activity in literature and art, had shown himself, during the long course of his Cardinalate, a warm friend to humanists, men of learning, and artists. The greatest poet of the Cinquecento, Ariosto, extolled in celebrated verses the circle of literary celebrities who gathered round the Cardinal.¹

The fine humanistic education of Alessandro, who had for a teacher, among others, Pomponio Leto, who spoke even Greek with fluency, whose orations were interwoven with classical quotations,² and who was widely versed in other departments of learning,³ enabled this prince of the Church to appreciate with thorough understanding the manifold

¹ Ecco Alessandro, il mio signor Farnese :
O dotta compagnia, che seco mena !
Fedro, Capella, Porzio, il Bolognese
Filippo, il Volterrano, il Maddalena,
Blosio, Pierio, il Vida Cremonense,
D' alta facondia inessiccabil vena,
E Lascari, e Musuro e Navagero,
E Andrea Marone e l' Monaco Severo.

(Orlando, 46, 13.)

² See AMASAEUS, 48 *seq.*

³ Especially in Mathematics (see PANVINIUS, Vita Pauli III.).

outcome of the Renaissance.¹ Had he become Pope on the death of Julius II. he would have promoted literature and learning in a very different way from Leo X., who only too often betrayed the spirit of the mere dilettante. When at last it came to be Farnese's lot to ascend the Papal throne a fundamental change had taken place in all conditions of Church and State.

The Renaissance had passed its zenith. In Rome the fatal year 1527 had wrought irreparable damage to learning and all had to be created anew. There had been yet another change: the ecclesiastical atmosphere was going through an elemental transformation. The sack of the city had left so deep an impression that a complete resuscitation of the former days of æsthetic enjoyment was impossible even in thought.² The great and still continued apostasy from Rome, the full momentum of which had never been realized by Leo X. or Clement VII., was pushing more and more imperiously tasks of ecclesiastical policy into the foreground, so that purely literary movements were not only obliged to recede but were themselves perforce turning into different channels. Little as men might think of denying the great achievements of the Renaissance, they were yet becoming conscious, face to face with the serious aspect of the times, of the necessity of breaking away from tendencies which were alien to the Church and from a patronage of culture which ministered only to a purely atheistic taste. The transition—from the century of Leo X. always dallying with the refinements of literature and art

¹ For the library formed by Paul III. when he was a Cardinal, see ROCCA, *Bibl. Vatic., Romae*, 1591, 398; it belonged afterwards to Cardinal A. Farnese (see *Cod. Vat.*, 6946, f. 169^b of Vatican Library). According to AMASÆUS (p. 27), A. Farnese was in the habit of making marginal notes on his books (*cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 553).

² See Vol. X. of this work, 443-447.

to an age agitated by political and theological questions—could only proceed by gradual steps under the reign of a Pope whose mind had been matured and whose reputation formed within the humanistic camp.¹

The whole pontificate of Paul III. was marked by a duality of character which is also discernible in his position as a patron of letters, art, and learning. A searching light is thrown upon the contrasts by which human life was traversed by the fact that high ecclesiastical positions were held at the same time by men representing such divergent tendencies as Giovanni della Casa and Filippo Archinto: the first frivolous and immoral in his life and in many of his writings;² the other serious, respected, and author of a treatise on the Sacraments dedicated to Paul III.³

The scope of Paul III.'s patronage was restricted not merely by the circumstance that, during the whole of his reign, ecclesiastical and political affairs had paramount claims on his attention, but by the not less hampering disadvantages of financial difficulties, the pinch of which were as severely felt at the close as at the beginning of his

¹ See REUMONT, III., 2nd ed., 687 *seq.*

² Giov. della Casa, in the service of Paul III. since 1537, was made Archbishop of Benevento in April 1544 and nuncio at Venice in August; see TIRABOSCHI, VII., 3, 18 *seq.*; GARAMPI, 266, and specially CAMPANA in *Studi Storici*, XVI., 1 *seq.*, 248 *seqq.*, 349 *seq.*; XVII., 145 *seqq.*; *cf.* also the literature cited by FLAMINI (p. 566) and JANSSEN-PASTOR, V., 16th ed., 368. Casa was not ordained priest until July 21, 1547 (see REZZI, *Let. di Giov. d. Casa*, Imola, 1824, 33).

³ *De fide et sacramentis*, Romae, 1545 (*cf.* MAZZUCHELLI, I., 2, 956). Archinto was made Bishop of Borgo S. Sepulcro in 1539, which he exchanged for Saluzzo in 1546. He was vicar-general of Paul III. (see Vol. XI. of this work, p. 208), and later vice-chamberlain (see LANCIANI, II., 98).

pontificate.¹ Besides this the Pope was also a strict economist;² consequently, the assistance given to men of learning and humanists, however good Paul III.'s original intentions may have been,³ continued to be much more limited⁴ than the expectations in such circles⁵ had been.

One of Paul III.'s first undertakings, of a characteristically practical kind, was the restoration of the Roman University reduced to complete ruin by the sack. The buildings were first of all reconstructed, revenues provided, and steps taken to obtain the services of good professors.⁶ Only a few weeks after his elevation the Pope invited the celebrated doctor of medicine, Girolamo Accoramboni, to come to Rome to give university lectures; since, so the Pontiff stated, "his duty no less than his love for his native city urged him to bear in view the restoration of this institution."⁷ Agostino Nifo, the distinguished philosopher who had already lectured in Rome under Leo X., was another who was invited.⁸ This summons was unsuccessful, as at a later date was that of Guglielmo Sirleto to be a professor of Greek. Nevertheless, Paul III. had already suc-

¹ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, pp. 156 *seq.*, 327, 344 *seq.*, and CAMPANA, *loc. cit.*, XVI., 266 *seq.* The Council cost Paul III. yearly 50,000-60,000 ducats (see Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 347, n. 1).

² Cf. our remarks, Vol. XI. of this work, p. 300 *seq.*

³ Cf. the brief to P. Bembo of Nov. 6, 1534. *Min. brev. Arm., 49, t. 49, n. 24 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ This is contrary to the panegyric of Lodovico Senso (QUIRINI, *Epist. Poli.*, II., 66), to whom TIRABOSCHI (VII., I, 19) and RENAZZI (II., 115) give a somewhat too hasty assent.

⁵ Cf. Bembo's letter in the *Opere*, IV., 232.

⁶ See RENAZZI, II., 95; MARINI, *Archiatri*, I., 383 *seq.*; II. 286 *seq.*

⁷ Brief of Nov. 2, 1534, in MARINI, II., 279 *seq.*

⁸ Cf. *ibid.*, I., 289; II., 284 *seq.* Cf. MARINI, *Lettera al ch. Mons. Muti Papazurri già Casali*, Roma, 1797, 120 *seq.*

ceeded in the autumn of 1536 in making the Sapienza an active centre of instruction. Cardinal Alessandro Farnese was Protector of the University and the protonotary Camillo Peruschi rector. The grammar schools which the Roman Senate had instituted in each quarter of the city were also dependent on the University.¹

The amount of success which attended the Pope's efforts to reanimate the Roman University is made clear from the lecture lists of the professors for the years 1535, 1539, 1542, and 1548 which have been preserved.² They give 18, 24, 20, and 29 professors for the four years respectively. The theologians and philosophers, who were only seven in 1539, were double that number in 1548. There is little difference in the number of teachers in other faculties, but on the other hand the names vary remarkably.³ There was an extraordinary discrepancy in the annual salaries, which fluctuated between 30 and 850 gold gulden. The best off were, generally speaking, the teachers of medicine and rhetoric; the smallest stipends were those of the professors of theology and philosophy. This is explained by the majority being taken from the religious orders. Dominicans, Carmelites, Augustinian Hermits, and Servites were all doing professorial duty, and from November 1537 to May 1539 the celebrated Jesuits, Diego Laynez and Peter Faber, delivered lectures in theology at the Sapienza in Rome.⁴

Among the professors of medicine the most celebrated

¹ See RENAZZI, II., 96 *seq.*, 113 *seq.* For Peruschi, see NOLHAC, *Bibl. de F. Orsini*, 173. For the numerous professors in the year 1536, see FICHARD, *Italia*, 55.

² Published by RENAZZI (II., 245-248); the oldest, by TACCHI VENTURI, in *Arch. Rom.*, XXIV., 264 *seq.*

³ See TACCHI VENTURI, *loc. cit.*, 261, 262.

⁴ *Cf. ibid.*, 262.

was the Neapolitan surgeon, Alfonso Ferri, who had been appointed as early as 1535 and who also delivered a course of lectures on anatomy at the request of Paul III. Paolo Belmesseri, a lecturer in medicine, made ventures into Latin poetry and dedicated one of his works to the Pope. Among medical practitioners mention is also made in 1539 of a Jew named Giacobbe; this was probably Paul III.'s Spanish physician, Diego Mantino, celebrated for his skill in his profession.¹

The teachers of rhetoric included, among others, the humanists Battista Pio and Leonardo da Barletta; the former, who enjoyed a high reputation, lived to the age of eighty-four.² In his place Paul III. obtained the services of Romolo Amaseo, a not less renowned scholar; his contemporaries called him the second Cicero, and his salary reached the remarkably unusual figure of 1413 gold gulden. Together with his professorship Amaseo also held the post of tutor to the young Cardinals Alessandro Farnese and Guido Ascanio Sforza in the department of *belles lettres*.³ He became permanently attached to the household of Alessandro Farnese and accompanied him even on his Legatine mission of 1546 to Germany during the Schmalkaldic war.⁴ Paul III. also appointed

¹ See RENAZZI, II., 107 *seq.*; RIEGER-VOGELSTEIN, II., 95 *seq.* For P. Belmesseri, see MARINI, I., 376 *seq.*; FLAMINI, Studi, 334 *seq.*; Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XI., 378 *seq.*; COSTA, P. Belmesseri, Torino, 1887.

² His epitaph in FORCELLA, II., 394.

³ Cf. the *brief to the Governor of Bologna, where Amaseo was teaching, Feb. 14, 1535. Min. brev. Arm., 40, t. 50, n. 453 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Cf. AMASAEUS, 20, 70; MAZZUCHELLI, I., 1, 583 *seq.*; RENAZZI, II., 112, 248. The statements here made have been overlooked by RONCHINI, who in the Atti Mod., VI., 275 *seq.*, gives documents from the Archives of Parma bearing on Amaseo's summons to Rome. For Amaseo, see also NOLHAC, Orsini, 134.

as colleagues with Amaseo in attendance on Cardinal Alessandro two other men of learning: the philosopher Antonio Bernardi and the Roman, Bernardino Maffei.¹

The value Paul III. attached to learning is shown by the care which he bestowed on the education of others of his family. One of the results of this was that even the dissolute Pier Luigi, whose instruction had been conducted by the poet Baldassare Molossi,² busied himself with the patronage of letters.³ The education of Ranuccio was entrusted by the Pope in 1540 to the humanist Francesco Florido Sabino, who was summoned to Rome for the purpose; this great scholar and truth-loving man was later placed in the same relation to Orazio Farnese.⁴ Ranuccio was accompanied to the University of Padua by Lodovico Beccadelli, who was later made secretary to the conciliar Legates, and after Ranuccio's elevation to the Cardinalate represented the latter in the Legation of the March.⁵

Alessandro, as well as Ranuccio Farnese, corresponded brilliantly to the hopes entertained by the Pope of their interest in things of the intellect. They were both so assiduous in supporting the claims of literary men that the praise lavished upon them in this respect by their contemporaries seems fully justified.⁶ Ranuccio Farnese's patronage of the arts belonged to a later date, that of Alessandro in part to the pontificate of Paul III. The apartments in the Cancelleria, which Alessandro occupied

¹ See *Atti Mod.*, V., 311 *seq.*

² *Cf.* AFFÒ, *Vita di B. Molossi*, Parma, 1779, 12 *seq.*

³ Besides POGGIALI, *Storia di Piacenza*, IX., 184, and AFFÒ (*passim*), *cf.* the interesting document given by RONCHINI in the *Atti Mod.*, IV., 186.

⁴ *Cf.* *Atti Mod.*, V., 385 *seq.*; *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, VIII., 337 *seq.*

⁵ See MAZZUCHELLI, II., 2, 577.

⁶ *Cf.* *Petri Victorii Epist.*, l. 2, f. 42; TIRABOSCHI, VII., 1, 20 *seq.*; see also CLAUSSE, *Les Farnèses*, 177 *seq.*

at that time as Vice-Chancellor, were the daily resort of men of letters. Here Vasari was urged to begin without delay his work on celebrated painters.¹ The most varied pursuits of learning met with sympathy from the young Farnesi and were supported by their liberality. They opened their hands to the wanton poet Francesco Maria Molza² as well as to the devout Marcantonio Flaminio.³ When it is remembered that the latter received property in land as well as a magnificent villa from the Cardinal, his verses extolling his patron to the skies are not unintelligible.⁴ Not merely Italian but foreign scholars as well dedicated their works to these generous patrons; thus the Augustinian Johann Hoffmeister his commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians.⁵ Giovio, Bembo,

¹ Cf. KALLAB, 145 *seq.*

² See SERASSI, *Poesie di Molza*, Milano, 1808, 82 *seq.*; cf. BUDIK, II., 57 *seq.*, 91 *seq.*

³ See COSTA in *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, X., 384 *seq.*; CUCCOLI, Flaminio, 119 *seq.*, 169. See also QUIRINI, *Imago*, 6 *seq.*; BUDIK, II., 113. Flaminio's "In librum psalmodum brevis explanatio ad A. Farnes. card." appeared from the Aldine press in Venice in 1545.

⁴ Cf. CIACONIUS, III., 558 *seq.*, 565. Other members of the Farnese family were also celebrated by contemporary poets; in particular Vittoria Farnese, who married in 1547 the Duke of Urbino. Cf. TARDUCCI, *L'Atanagi da Cagli*, Cagli, 1904, 51. Cod. Urb., 742, contains the *Epithalamium (dedicated to Cardinal A. Farnese) Guidob. Roberii et Victoriae Farnesiae Urb. ducum, of Janus Vital. Panormit. civ. Rom. In Cod. Vat., 9063, f. 7^b of the Vatican Library, there is a poem "in Victoriae Farnesiae partum."

⁵ See PAULUS, Hoffmeister, 186 *seq.* Another foreign dedication of 1546 is mentioned in the *Zeitschr. des westpreuss. Geschichtl. Vereins*, XLII., 85; cf. also BALBI, *Opera*, I., 229. Investigators of maps of America may have their attention called to the rare impression dedicated to Card. A. Farnese: *Compendium in sphaeram per Pierium Valerianum Bellunensem*. Impressit Romae Ant. Bladus Platina Asulanus cum privilegio ne quis alius imprimat sub anathematis poena et pecuniaria mulcta ut in brevi apost. continetur 1537. Mense Apr.

Fracastoro, Claudio Tolomei, Pier Vettori, Carlo Gualteruzzi¹ were on confidential terms with Alessandro, and two of his secretaries, Bernardino Maffei and Marcello Cervini, attained to the purple. Later on Annibale Caro also entered Alessandro's service after having been secretary to Pier Luigi from 1543 to 1547. With Alessandro he then remained up to his death on the 21st of November 1566. The innumerable letters which he wrote in Farnese's service were with justice lavishly rewarded. These documents, which also form a source of historical information, show that their writer was a master of the Tuscan idiom; they are always appropriate to their subject, always composed in a finished style, filled with true Italian grace, and, with all their charm, simple and clear.²

Paul III. was even more versatile than Alessandro in his patronage of letters of various sorts. The Pope, who in his leisure hours delighted in Greek and Latin poetry,³ was

¹ Cf. MARMITTA, *Rime*, Parma, 1564, 120. Cf. RONCHINI, Jacopo Marmitta, in *Atti Mod.*, I., 15 *seq.*, with extracts from the Archives of Parma. More will be found about A. Farnese's literary circle in the following volumes: REUMONT, III., 2, 549; NOLHAC, Orsini, 13 *seq.*; *Lett. di B. Cappello*, Bologna, 1870, vii *seq.* Some of Gualteruzzi's letters have been printed (Pesaro, 1884).

² See SEGHEZZI, *Vita del com. A. Caro* in the first part of the *Lett. di A. Caro*, Padova, 1765; CANTALAMESSA CARBONI, *Ricerche sulla vita di A. Caro*, Ascoli, 1858; FLAMINI, 478 *seq.* For special information on Caro's *Epistolario*, see N. ANGELETTI in the *Scuola Romana*, IV. (1886), n. 5. For Caro as Pier Luigi's secretary, see PICCO in *Bollett. stor. Piacent.*, II., and *N. Antologia*, 1907, Ottobre. See also BERNETTI, *A. Caro*, Porto Civitanova, 1907; CIAN and STERZI in the *Zeitschr.*; LE MARCHE, VII., 2; SASSO, *A. Caro e Giov. Guidiccioni*, Fabriano, 1908; STERZI, in the *Atti e memorie della r. deputaz. di storia patria per le prov. delle Marche*, N.S., V., 1-2.

³ See GYRALDUS, *de Poet. nostrorum temp.*, ed. WOTKE, Berlin, 1894, 73; RENAZZI, II., 93. According to CIACONIUS (III., 553), Paul III. also had some verses attributed to him.

certainly not in a position to support all the horde of scholars, literati, poets, and poetasters who were wandering about without bread to eat after the irruption of so many catastrophes on Italy, but he had nevertheless opened havens of refuge to many of these unfortunates.¹ During his reign the poets were, on the whole, more in the background than during the epoch of Leo X.² Men of a practical turn of thought were the most popular. Theologians and canonists were in favour, for in view of the harassed state of the Church the support of such writers made a stronger appeal than the support of poets; many of the latter therefore tried to attract the Pope's favour by applying the Muse to theological subjects.³ What a complete change the age had undergone is shown in the relations of Paul III. with Marco Girolamo Vida, at one time the delight of Leo X. Vida had at one time belonged to Farnese's literary group, but now the two corresponded on the suppression of the religious innovations which had been attracting notice also in Vida's bishopric of Alba.⁴

The poets who are associated with the reign of Paul III. may be named. They were: Angelo Colocci, the successor in 1537 of Favorino as Bishop of Nocera;⁵ Fabio Vigili, an official of the chancery and Bishop of Spoleto, his birth-place,⁶ since 1540; Eurialo Morani of Ascoli; the Peru-

¹ Thus REUMONT, III., 2, 696.

² Hence Molza's complaint (SADOLETI, Opera, II., 137).

³ See a specimen in CIACONIUS, III., 556.

⁴ See RONCHINI in the Atti Mod., IV., 75 *seq.*; NOVATI in Arch. Stor. Lomb., XXV., 236, 270 *seqq.*

⁵ See UGHELLI, I., 1072; *cf.* the Monograph referred to by us, Vol. VIII. of this work, 186 n.

⁶ *Cf.* MARINI, Archiatri, II., 287 *seq.*; GARAMPI, 259. F. Flavius congratulates F. Vigili on his appointment as "epistolar. magister" to the Pope, in a letter dat. Foligno, Nov. 27, 1537. The MS. is in possession of Faloci-Pulignani at Spoleto.

gian, Francesco Coppetta ;¹ Rodolfo Aracintio ;² Vincenzo Astemio of Venafro ;³ Astorre Baglioni, who was also a Roman Senator and a valiant warrior ;⁴ Novidio Fracco ;⁵ Marcantonio Flaminio ;⁶ Angelo Perotti of Camerino ;⁷ Giangiorgio Trissino, the author of the heroic epic "Italia liberata" ;⁸ lastly, Girolamo Borgia.⁹ The latter in exuberant language thanked the Pope for the many marks of his favour, praised his liberality, magnanimity, and architectural energy ; nor were the young Farnesi, especially Cardinal Alessandro, forgotten in this poet's enthusiastic verse.¹⁰ Borgia, since 1544 Bishop of Massalubrese,

¹ For both these, see *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, XXXIX., 6 *seq.*, and *Suppl.*, III., 93 *seq.*

² MAZZUCHELLI (I., 2, 926) only gives : "Epithalamii virginei libri 3, Roma 1541," dedicated to Margareta Farnese. In *Cod. Vat.*, 3608, I found : **Aracynthi Elegia ad Paulum III. and his relatives* ; here f. 21^b among other pieces is also a poem "In obitum ill. d. Juliae Pha.," the sister of Paul III. *Cod. Vat.*, 3701, of the Vatican Library (dedication copy with illuminations) contains **Carmina anonymi in laudem Pauli III.*

³ **Vincentii Franciscucci Abstemii (cf. MAZZUCHELLI, II., 3, 1182) De laudibus astrologiae ad Paulum III., dat. postridie Id. Oct. 1541. Cod. Vat.*, 3687, Vatican Library.

⁴ See MAZZUCHELLI, II., 1, 44 *seq.*

⁵ Author of an imitation of Ovid's *Fasti*, dedicated to Paul III. (see *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, IX., 466 *seq.*).

⁶ See CUCCOLI, 112 *seq.*, 118.

⁷ His *ode to Paul III. in *Cod. Vat.*, 9063, f. 7^b-8^b (Vatican Library).

⁸ *Cf. MORSOLIN, Trissino, 242 seq., 277 seq.* ; see also Trissino's letter to Paul III. of Dec. 6, 1543 (and our remarks, Vol. VIII. of this work, 218 *seq.*), published by CROCE in the *Scritti di storia (Nozze Fedele de Fabritiis, Napoli, 1908, 76 seq.)*.

⁹ *Cf. MAZZUCHELLI, II., 3, 1750.*

¹⁰ See *Hieronymi Borjii Epigrammata* in **Cod. Barb. lat.*, 1903. A great number of the poems have been printed from this MS. in the rare collection "Carmina lyrica et heroica quae extant D. Hieronymus Borgia ex fratre pronepos ad gentilis sui memoriam restaurandam

also made essays in history and dedicated to Paul III. his work on the wars of Italy, which showed more patriotism than critical insight.¹ The crown of poet laureate was bestowed by Paul III. on the gifted Polish poet Clement Janitius.²

Characteristics of the literary life of Rome at this time were the academies³ and the unflagging popularity of satire. Few families of that day suffered so much from Pasquino's biting tongue as the Farnesi, for Paul III. and his house certainly gave his mockery rich opportunities.⁴ Immediately after his election Paul III. was attacked

ex adversariis collegit et foras prodire iussit, Venetiis 1666" (*cf.* MAZZUCHELLI, II., 3, 1750). The poem "De incendio ad Avernum lacum prid. Kal. Octob. facto A^o 1538 ad Paulum III. P. carmen heroicum, Neapoli, s.a.," is to be found in the Casanatense Library in Rome (see *Bibl. Casanat. Catal.*, I., Romae, 1761, 763).

¹ H. Borgia, *Hist. de bellis ital., quoted by Mazzuchelli from a private library, is also among the MSS. in the Library of S. Mark, Venice. Borgia gives incredible anecdotes of Alexander VI. (*cf.* BROSCHE, Kirchenstaat, I., 16). The work is quoted as "Istoria de 'suoi tempi lib. 20" in the Nuovo Dizionario storico, Napoli, 1791. There is a confused dedication in the Italian translation in the Carte Farnes., 1^a (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See ĆWIKLIŃSKI, Klemens Janicki, Kraków, 1893.

³ *Cf.* RENAZZI, II., 128 *seq.*; FLAMINI, 100. For the Vitruvian Academy, see KRAUS-SAUER, 2, 695 *seq.*

⁴ *Cf.* ABED-EL-KADR-SALZA in Giorn. d. Lett. Ital., XLIII., 198 *seq.* Besides the Cod. Ottob., 2817, there were also in *Ottob., 2811: Libro delle pasquille novi et vecchi ital. in verso incominciato 1544, and 2812: Libri di pasquilli volg. ital. in prosa, 1544 (Vatican Library), at the disposal of students. For satires against Paul III., see CANTÙ, II., 216 *seq.*; SCHADE, I., 44 *seq.*, II., 117 *seq.*; RANKE, Zur Kritik neuerer Geschicht-schreiber, 28*; Giorn. d. Lett. Ital., XXXIII., 44; CAPASSO, Viaggio di P. Luigi, 20; CAVAZZUTI, Castelvetro, 54 n. Rabelais also speaks most contemptuously of Paul III. (see BAUMGARTNER, V., 254 *seq.*; Rev. d'hist. dipl., XII., 217 *seq.*; XIV., 222 *seq.*, 244 *seqq.*).

by Pietro Aretino in a very envenomed poem entitled "Pasquino in colera"—"Pasquino in a rage."¹ This did not prevent the talented but covetous satirist, whose pen, like an engine of war, was turned against every famous reputation in Italy, from sending flattering letters to Paul III., whom he had so grossly outraged, on the occasion of his journey to Nice, or even from despatching to that congress a confidential messenger who was honourably received by the Pope, the Emperor, and Francis I.² As he was afterwards insufficiently honoured by the powers at Rome, he affected a profound contempt for the whole Curia.³ In 1540 he composed again a sonnet against Paul III. but did not publish it,⁴ and in 1543 he wrote anonymously a violent libel on the high society of Rome.⁵ Later he offered to dedicate his tragedy *Orazia* to Pier Luigi Farnese for 150 scudi. When he got the money he made a similar proposal to the Pope in a letter of fulsome adulation, and afterwards abused him in the coarsest language in a letter to Cosimo de' Medici. How Aretino, in spite of these proceedings, flattered himself that he would be made a Cardinal, is inconceivable. In January 1547 he wrote again to the Pope, but did not receive from him the anticipated reward.⁶

Niccolò Franco was Aretino's rival in scurrilous and indecent verse-making. First the friend and then the furious enemy of Aretino, Franco had to leave Venice in 1539. On his wanderings he came to Rome, where he

¹ See LUZIO in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XIX., 102.

² See Lett. di Aretino, I. (1609), 67 seq., 266 seq.; LUZIO, Pronostico, 133.

³ See Lett. di Aretino (ed. 1539), f. 39; cf. BURCKHARDT, I., 10th ed., 178.

⁴ Giorn. d. Lett. Ital., XXIX., 255 n.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XXVI., 176 seq.

See Atti Mod., III., 86 seqq.

disguised himself as a religious and thus managed to gain the confidence of Cardinal Morone. When it was established that Franco, in a collection of satirical sonnets, had indulged to an incredible degree in obscenity and profanity, the Pope gave orders for his expulsion from Rome.¹

As Paul III. was interested² in history it is remarkable that he should have disregarded Paolo Giovio, who played a great part in the Roman literary world.³ In his *Histories* Giovio had expressed a hope, which was the outcome of a faulty judgment on present affairs, that the accession of the Farnese Pope would mean a return to the golden age of Leo X. All the greater was his disappointment when he saw this hope disappear. Nevertheless, Giovio remained in Rome for some years as the centre of an intellectual circle, but finally, in 1548, when the vacant bishopric of Como was not offered to him, he left Rome in disgust.⁴

To the humanists also belonged the celebrated Veronese physician and astronomer Girolamo Fracastoro. He dedicated to the Pope a work on medicine and one on astronomy, and was appointed, as a mark of gratitude,

¹ Cf. SIMIANI, N. Franco, Torino, 1894, 34 *seq.*, 106 *seq.* For the letters of Franco in the *Cod. Vat., 5642, see SICARDI in *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, XXVI., 223 *seq.*

² Cf. *Carte Strozzi*, I., 323.

³ The "Dispensa" for the sake of the composition of the "Istorie" of Oct. 21, 1537, is in FONTANA, II., 469 *seq.*

⁴ Cf. CIAN in *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, XVII., 337. In the Index of the *Brevia Pauli III.* of 1539 a *letter to the Archbishop of Capua of the following tenor is found: Since the prior and community of the Benedictine Abbey of La Cava impede P. Jovius, episc. Nucern., in the jurisdiction of his city and diocese and continue to do so notwithstanding letters from their Protector, Cardinal Campeggio, orders were given that the opposition to Jovius should cease (Secret Archives of the Vatican). Giovio tried afterwards to avenge himself on Paul III. (see CIAN in *Arch. Stor. Lomb.*, XVII. [1890], 829 *seq.*)

physician to the Council of Trent.¹ As such he played an important part in March 1547 in the removal of the Synod to Bologna, thereby incurring severe censure in many quarters,² while Paul III. and Cardinal Farnese remained, as before, his constant patrons.³

The astrologer Pomponio Gaurico⁴ has been already mentioned. With him the learned philosopher Ubaldini Bandinelli and the mathematician Alfano Alfani shared the Pope's favour; the former became Bishop of Montefiascone and Corneto in 1548, the latter for seven-and-thirty years was at the head of the treasury in his native town, Perugia.⁵ In the autumn of 1537 Paul III. summoned Gasparo Insoni to Rome for the reform of the calendar.⁶

The most eminent representative of ancient classical learning in Rome under Paul III. was Latino Giovenale Manetti, who had already, under Leo X., given proofs of his diplomatic ability.⁷ Paul III. also entrusted him with several missions. Thus in December 1534 he was sent to

¹ Cf. MARINI, I., 389 *seq.*; II., 290 *seq.*; BUDIK, II., 190 *seq.*; Jahrb. des österr. Kaiserhauses, V., 58 *seq.* Cf. ROSSI, G. Fracastoro, Pisa, 1893; E. BARBARANI, G. Fracastoro, Verona, 1897.

² See the letter of an anonymous medical enemy in Nuntiaturberichte, IX., 657 *seq.*

³ Cf. RONCHINI in the Atti Mod., V., 194 *seq.* The physician Ferd. Balamius dedicated to Paul III. the work of Galenus, de ossibus, Paris, 1535 (see MARINI, I., 315; ROTH, Vesalius, 55, n. 1). Paul's private physician, Silvio Zeffiri, dedicated a very rare work to his master: Sylvii | Zephyri | Ro. Philo | sophi et medici | Pontificii | de pu | tredine sive de | protrahenda | vita libel | lus | Ad Paulum III. Pont. | Max. Principem | optimum. | Impressum Romae in Campo Florae in aedibus Antonii | Bladi Asulani mense Novembri | 1536. 43 leaves in 4°.

⁴ See Vol. XI. of this work, p. 39 n.

⁵ See MAZZUCHELLI, I., 1, 466; II., 216; cf. MORONI, LII., 159.

⁶ See FONTANA, I., 505.

⁷ See our statements, Vol. VIII. of this work, 242.

Venice ;¹ between 1535 and 1540 he went no less than five times as nuncio to the court of France,² and in 1538 he had also to visit Scotland.³

Manetti, who was Papal private secretary, had already been appointed in 1534 to the lucrative post of a treasurer in Piacenza ; on the 8th of November of the same year he was appointed commissary of Roman Antiquities, and somewhat later the Papal Mint was also entrusted to him.⁴ In 1536 he had the honour to conduct the Emperor to see the monuments of ancient Rome. With Sadoletto and Bembo he was on intimate terms. History owes a great debt to Manetti, for it was he who induced Bembo to publish the briefs which he had composed as secretary to Leo X., a work dedicated to Paul III. as an exhortation that the Roman Chancery should maintain the tradition of a good Latin style.⁵ The confidence in which Manetti was held by the Pope is clearly set forth in passages in the autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini.⁶

Diplomatic commissions were also entrusted to Bartolommeo Cavalcanti⁷ and the highly cultivated Giovanni Guidiccioni of Lucca, made Bishop of Fossombrone in 1534. The latter in the beginning of 1535 had the difficult task of representing Paul III. at the Emperor's court in Spain. Arriving in that country in March, he accompanied Charles V. on the expedition to Tunis, returned with him to Italy, and remained with him as nuncio up to August 1537.

¹ See MARINI, Archiatri, I., 384, 385.

² See PIEPER, 110 *seq.*, 116 *seq.*, 122 *seq.*, 160 *seq.*, 215 ; Nuntiaturberichte, I., 359 ; III., 338, 378 *seq.* ; IV., 54.

³ See BELLESHEIM, Schottland, I., 339, 490.

⁴ See MARINI, I., 385 ; REUMONT, III., 2nd ed., 353.

Cf. our statements, Vol. VIII. of this work, Appendix No. 22. For the post of commissary of antiquities, see *infra*, 563 *seq.*

⁶ Cellini Vita, ed. BACCI, 143.

⁷ *Cf.* Atti Mod., IV., 142 *seq.*, 158 *seq.*

Guidiccioni now became President of the Romagna, with Annibale Caro as his secretary; he was afterwards commissary of the Papal troops in the campaign against the Colonna, and finally governor of the March of Ancona. His fidelity to duty in all the positions to which he was called was celebrated by his contemporaries; he was, it was believed, destined for the Cardinalate if he had not been snatched away by an early death in 1541. The letters of Guidiccioni, whose poetical work also is still highly prized at the present day, are not merely important sources of information for the historian, but possess excellence of style; they lose nothing in comparison with those of Guicciardini.¹

A not less attractive figure was that of Blossius Palladius, whose name, according to the usage of the Roman Academy, was thus latinized from Biagio Pallai. He had already distinguished himself as a poet and composer of classical briefs under Leo X. and Clement VII.² The important and lucrative office of secretary of Latin briefs was entrusted permanently during the reign of Paul III. to this master of classical phraseology. The Pope, who set the highest value on the learning and integrity of Palladius, rewarded his faithful services in 1540 by conferring upon him the bishopric of Foligno, which he resigned in 1547 in favour of Isidoro Clario. Palladius did not long survive his patron. The visitor to the Church

¹ Cf. MINUTOLI, *Opere di G. Guidiccioni*, I., II., Firenze, 1867; BENINCASA, *G. Guidiccioni*, Roma, 1895; FLAMINI, 420 *seq.*; *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XXVI., 250; LI., 407 *seq.*; CHIORBOLI, *G. Guidiccioni*, Jesi, 1908; SASSI, *A. Caro e G. Guidiccioni*, Fabriano, 1908. Dionisio Atanagi, the editor of the noted and valuable collection of letters, was the lifelong secretary to Guidiccioni (see TARDUCCI, *L'Atanagi da Cagli*, 4).

² Cf. Vol. VIII. of this work, 190, 212 n., 227, and Vol. X., 335; GARAMPI, *App.* 255; MERKLE, II., 185; *Giorn. d. Lett. Ital.*, XLV., 67.

of S. Maria in Aquiro in Rome will see there, close to the first pillar on the left hand of the nave, the simple tomb of this renowned Latinist; a marble bust exhibits the noble and serious features of this remarkable man, to whom this memorial was raised by the hospital and orphanage adjoining the church upon which he had bestowed all his substance.¹

Great is the number of canonists and theologians who stood in relations with Paul III. and received support from him. First to claim mention are the professors of the Roman University, especially the Dominicans Fra Cipriano, Alberto Duisnio, and Teofilo di Tropea, the Carmelites Fra Egidio and Antonio Marinari, the Augustinian Hermit Ambrogio Quistelli, the Minorite Bonaventura Pio, Jacopo Giacomelli, who sprang from a Roman family famous for learning, and, last and most remarkable of all, Diego Laynez, who succeeded St. Ignatius in the generalship of the Society of Jesus.²

Andreas Camutius dedicated to Paul III. a work against Luther and other Protestant assailants of the Church.³ The Minorite, Petrus Galatinus, also dedicated two theological works to the Pope,⁴ as did Joannes Baptista Albinianus Tretius his edition of the three

¹ See the inscription in FORCELLA, II., 439.

² See RENAZZI, II., 98 *seqq.* For the theologian Niccolò Alessi, see MAZZUCHELLI, I., 1, 463. For Egidio Foscarari, who was Master of the Sacred Palace in 1546, *cf.* TIRABOSCHI, VII., 1, 271 *seq.*

³ *A Camutius ad S. D. N. Paulum III. in ecclesiae cath. defensionem contra haeresiarchas nostrae tempestatis. Dat Lucani prid. Cal. Julius 1544 (Cod. Vat., 3725, Vatican Library). Camutius had come to know the Pope before his election, as he says in his preface, and certainly in Parma.

⁴ *Petri Galatinii min., poenit. apost., De vera theologia, Pars. I. (Cod. Vat., 5570, Vatican Library). The same, *De ecclesia cath. libri 3 ad Paulum III. (Cod. Vat., 5575).

writings of his father against the Lutheran heresy.¹ Among canonists, Paolo Borghasio² and Giovanni Girolamo Albani³ deserve mention, but the pre-eminence belongs to Tommaso Campeggio, a younger brother of Cardinal Lorenzo, who was frequently employed in the chancery, the German nuntiature, and politico-ecclesiastical negotiations. Sadoletto esteemed Tommaso so highly that he considered him worthy of the Cardinalate.⁴ He would indeed have been suited for the Sacred College, as its ranks at that time contained a whole series of famous scholars, whose elevation gave a brilliant testimony to the Pope's love of learning.

Of the celebrated Cardinals created by Paul III., so much has been said in accounts of this pontificate that it is sufficient to reproduce their names: Gasparo Contarini, John Fisher, Cristoforo Jacobazzi, Jacopo Sadoletto, Rodolfo Pio of Carpi, Hieronymus Aleander, Reginald Pole, Pietro Bembo, Federigo Fregoso, Marcello Cervini, Bartolommeo Guidiccioni, Gregorio Cortese, Giovanni Morone, Tommaso Badia, Jacopo Savelli, Niccolò Ardinghello, Federigo Cesi, and Bernardino Maffei. Even if many of the above owed their promotion to reasons, in the first instance, of an ecclesiastical character, the claims of literature were by no means held in secondary consideration. Of this Bembo is the most illustrious example. His elevation to

¹ Petri Albiniani Tretii, *Tractatus aureus de Pontif. potestate, de thesauro ecclesiae et de confessione contra Lutheranos errores*, Venetiis, 1545 (f. 3-5 the dedication of Joh. Bapt. to Paul III.).

² MAZZUCHELLI, II., 3, 1718.

³ G. G. Albani dedicated three works to Paul: (1) *De cardinalatu*, Romae, 1541; (2) *De potestate papae et concilii*, Venetiis, 1544, and often (see Mazzuchelli, I., 1, 273); (3) **De primatu ecclesiae Romanae*, bought in MS. in the autumn of 1894 (Manzoni Library, Rome).

⁴ See RENAZZI, II., 122, and *Nuntiaturberichte*, II., III. *seq.*; cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 110.

the Cardinalate was an act of homage to the spirit of humanism, and the same in a certain sense may be said of Sadoletto. It was besides very characteristic of Paul III. that he should have associated this distinguished man with the studies and tasks which the situation of the Church demanded. Sadoletto had congratulated him on his election to the Papacy,¹ and on the 3rd of January 1535 he received a brief from Paul III. thanking him, assuring him of his intention to withstand the onslaught of Protestantism, and expressing a hope that Sadoletto would give him the assistance of his learning.²

In the same way Erasmus was urgently exhorted to devote the rich gifts he had received from God to the defence of the Catholic faith; such services would be of special value at the moment when the Council was about to begin its labours.³ Paul III. set great store by the participation of Erasmus in the theological controversy, as he was of opinion that the success of the Catholic disputants would to a great extent depend upon their possession of a classical style.⁴

The protection of the Catholic faith was the primary motive which led Paul III. to favour the University of Ingolstadt⁵ and the institute founded in Dillingen by

¹ SADOLETI, Opera, I., 197-200.

² Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 50, n. 14 (Secret Archives of Vatican).

³ See the brief of May 31, 1535, in ERASMI, Opera, ed. CLERICUS, IV., Lugd. Batav., 1703, 1501-1502, and again in FONTANA, I., 492 *seq.*, this brief is in answer to Erasmus's letter of Jan. 23, 1535, in CARDAUNS, Paul III., 202 *seq.*; for the friendly relations between Erasmus and Paul III., *cf.* RAUMER, Histor. Taschenbuch, VI., 11, 149; FONTANA, I, 494.

⁴ See TIRABOSCHI, VII., l. 18.

⁵ See PRANTL, Geschichte der Universität Ingolstadt, I., 183. For an act of grace of Paul III. for the University of Heidelberg, see HAUTZ, Die Universität Heidelberg, I., 452.

Cardinal Truchsess.¹ On the other hand, the pursuit of learning was the principal object with which the University of Macerata was founded in 1540.²

In July 1536 a considerable number of theologians were called to Rome by Paul III. in view of the approaching Council. Among them were Fregoso, Cortese, Carafa, Giberti, Pole, Sadoletto, and Bartolommeo Guidiccioni; with the exception of the latter all accepted the invitation.³ In the spring of the following year the Pope asked the University of Salamanca to afford him the assistance in the matter of the Council of two of its most famous members: Pedro Ortiz and Francisco à Vittoria.⁴ The former remained in Rome till 1540 and then took part in the religious conferences at Worms and Ratisbon. Francisco à Vittoria, a Dominican, was deserving of the high praise which Paul III. bestowed upon him in the brief above mentioned when he spoke of him as the most famous theologian of the University of Salamanca; he was certainly the founder of the newer scholasticism. Unfortunately the health of this teacher, worn out by indefatigable exertions in the University since 1526, did not permit him, now in his fifty-seventh year, to undertake the arduous journey to Italy. In 1544 he had to resign his professorship, and on the 12th of August 1546 he died. Although not present personally at Trent he exercised a great influence there, as the period of his activity as a teacher

¹ Cf. SPECHT, *Gesch. der Universität Dillingen*, Freiburg, 1902, 6.

² Cf. Bull., VI., 283; TIRABOSCHI, VII., I, 100; DENIFLE, *Die Universitäten*, I., 223. The ordinances of Paul III. concerning the University of Pisa in FEDELI, *Doc. Pontif. riguard. l'univ. di Pisa*, Pisa, 1908, 123 *seq.* As Fedeli (p. 75) justly remarks, they were only flogging a dead horse, "uccidere un morto."

³ The letter relating to this in EHSES, IV., 26 *seq.*

⁴ This brief also, *ibid.*, IV., cxxxviii *seq.*

corresponded with the flourishing time of that theology which gave the Spanish divines so great an influence in the Council.¹

It was the Council again which brought Sadoletto² and other Cardinals to Rome in 1545, and in March 1546 the learned jurist Andrea Alciati, afterwards appointed proto-notary.³ About the same time Girolamo Seripando, the General of the Augustinian Hermits, was permitted to appoint, during his detention at Trent, a substitute to preside at the chapter of the congregation of the Order.⁴ The Dominican, P. Domenico Soto, who had taken a prominent part in formulating the dogmatic decrees of the Council, was permitted by a special grace of the Holy See to reckon the time spent by him in Trent as involving no suspension of his professorial duties at Salamanca.⁵ The learned Isidoro Clario, who had sat on the Council as an Abbot and given brilliant evidence of his gifts, was made Bishop of Foligno on January the 14th, 1547.⁶ In connection with the Council, Paul III. in April 1547

¹ Cf. specially EHRLE in *Katholik*, 1884, II., 505 *seq.*; see also SCHEEBEN in *Wetzer und Welte, Kirchenlex.*, IV., 2nd ed., 1837 *seq.*

² Cf. SADOLETI, *Opera*, II., 150, 231.

³ *Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 35, n. 202 (dat. 1546, March 20), in Secret Archives of the Vatican. For Alciati, see MAZZUCHELLI, I., 1, 354 *seq.*, and the monograph of E. V. MÖLLER (1907); here (p. 80 *seq.*) for the successful efforts of Paul III., in 1539 and 1540, to keep Alciati at the University of Bologna, and (p. 85 *seq.*) for the reported offer of the Cardinalate.

⁴ Min. brev., *loc. cit.*, n. 215 (dat. 1546, March 26).

⁵ Brief of Oct. 7, 1546 (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 37, n. 614, Secret Archives of the Vatican). For Soto, see ECHARD, II., 171 *seq.*

⁶ See MERKLE, I., 613; cf. *ibid.*, 207; MAZZUCHELLI, VII., 1, 275 *seq.* LAUCHERT in the *Studien aus dem Benediktiner-Orden*, XXIX., 611 *seq.*

commissioned Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga, as Protector of the Congregation of the Lateran, to take steps for reanimating the spirit of study in that body.¹

Modern investigation has established the claim of Paul III. to rank as one of the benefactors of the Vatican library. Practical in all his undertakings, he here took special care for the compilation of new catalogues and the preservation of damaged manuscripts.² The office of librarian lay at first in the experienced hands of Aleander. On his becoming Cardinal, a very suitable successor was found in Agostino Steuco, who had been custodian of the famous library of Cardinal Grimani.³ This versatile scholar, who had also written against Luther, had already been appointed Bishop of Kisamo in Candia. Steuco dedicated to his patron, together with a great philosophical work,⁴ a treatise also on the navigation of the Tiber,⁵ but as a librarian he did not come up to expectation.⁶ It was fortunate that in 1548 he was replaced by the learned Cardinal Marcello Cervini, under whom the library made

¹ Brief of April 6, 1547. Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 38, n. 407 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See MÜNTZ, *Bibl. du Vatican*, 80 *seq.* FABRICIUS (Roma, 216) divides the Papal libraries into three classes: "una clausa, cui adjuncta proxime est altera, item clausa, tertia certis diebus et horis patens et Graecis Latinisque scriptoribus referta."

³ On Oct. 27, 1538 (see ASSEMANNI, *Bibl. Vat., Cat. Cod., I., i, Rom., 1756, LXII.*).

⁴ *De philosophia perenni* (*Cod. Vat., 6377); STEUCHI, *Opera Omnia* a P. A. Morando recognita, III., Venetiis, 1591, 1 *seq.* For Steuco, see specially MAZZUCHELLI, VII., 1, 314 *seq.*; *cf.* CAVALIERI, *Bibl. d. uomini ill. d. congreg. Later., 22 seq., 36*; WILLMANN, *Gesch. des Idealismus*, III., 170.

⁵ *De restituenda navigatione Tiberis a Trusiamno agri Perusini castello usque Romam*, Roma, 1547; *cf.* NISSEN, *Ital. Landeskunde*, I., 320.

⁶ *Cf.* MERKLE, I., 210, n. 1.

great strides.¹ To his initiative and the co-operation of Sadoletto the Vatican library was indebted for new catalogues of the Greek² and Latin MSS.; the latter numbered 3096 codices.³ An important feature of this work of cataloguing was the assignment of consecutive numeration.⁴ The Pope took pains to increase the collection by recovering documents lost during the sack and ordering others to be transferred from Avignon to Rome.⁵ There are unprinted "acta" of this reign showing that Paul III.,

¹ See POLLIDORUS, *Vita Marcelli*, II., 45 *seqq.*; NOLHAC, Orsini, 248; *cf.* MÜNTZ, *loc. cit.*, 87; BATIFFOL, 18 *seq.*; MERKLE, I., 381; DOREZ in the *Rev. d. Bibl.*, V., 139 *seq.*, 220. In the *dedication of the *Cod. Vat.*, 3967, F. Ruano says to Cardinal Cervini: "Qui plus quam quingentis voluminibus Latinis, Graecis, et Hebraeis Bibliothecam auxisti et exornasti et augere et exornare perseveras" (Vatican Library).

² (A) *Catalogo alfabetico* [Vat. gr., 1482 A; 1482 B; Reg. graec., 171; Paris. gr., 3062] and *inventario* [Vat. gr., 1484; Vat. Cat., 7764; Mutin. gr., 232; ed. HAASE in *Serapeum*, XII. (1851), 130 *seqq.* (Greek); ed. MONTFAUCON, *Bibl. Bibliothecarum*, I., 5-14, Lat. from *Cod. Colb.*, 5153] "dei MSS. greci Vaticani del tempo dello Steuco, compilato in greco da Michele Rhosaites [Rosseto, † before Oct. 24, 1544] per ordine di Paolo III." (B) "Index [Inventario] Bibliothecae publicae Graecae Vaticanae confectus a Metello, Calendis Septembris MDXLV" [incomplete, Vat. Cat., 7132, ined.]. (C) "Inventario dei codici greci compilato in latino da Nic. Maiorano e Gugl. Sirleto per ordine del Card. Cervini" [begun in April 1548, Vat. lat., 7131, f. 33-190]. *Invent. vecchio*, n. 10 [begun Nov. 13, 1548; here begins the consecutive numeration (1-512)]. *Inventario compendioso* [Vat. lat., 3957, Marc. XIV., 921, ined.].

³ **Cod. Vat.*, 3967-3969, of the Vatican Library; *cf.* EHRLE in *Histor. Jahrb.*, XI., 726; BATIFFOL, *La Vaticane*, 20 *seq.*; see also *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, IX., 455, n. 3.

⁴ The "Inventario dei MSS. latini," with consecutive numeration, arranged by Ferd. Ruano and dedicated to Cardinal Cervini in *Cod. Vat. lat.*, 3957 (of the time of Paul III.; Vols. II. and III. of the time of Julius III.).

⁵ *Cf.* MÜNTZ, *loc. cit.*, 80, 87.

like his predecessors Leo X. and Clement VII., made search abroad for rare Latin and Greek manuscripts; for instance, among the Maronites of Lebanon in 1542¹ and in southern Italy in 1548.² By the nomination of a Cardinal as librarian, the position of custodian of the Vatican library had been greatly raised in importance;³ under Paul III. this post was held by Fausto Sabeo and Niccolò da Maggiorano; they were now reinforced by scribes who attended to the restoration and illumination of manuscripts.⁴ If among them two Greeks also appear,⁵ this is explained by Paul III.'s keen interest in the language of Homer. Among his familiars was Nicolas Sophianos, who, like others of his countrymen, dedicated works to the Pope.⁶ The celebrated Giano Lascaris had been recalled in 1534 to Rome, but unfortunately died in the following year.⁷ In agreement with Paul III., Marcello Cervini conceived in 1539 the magnificent scheme of making the most valuable Greek manuscripts accessible to the world of learning by means of the printing-press. The famous Antonius Bladus was chosen as printer, and went to Venice where, through the services of Aldus

¹ See in Appendix No. 20 the instruction for the guardian of the convent of Sion in Jerusalem (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Appendix No. 36.

³ The title now runs, Bibl. Apost. Vat. Protector (see ASSEMANNI, I., I, lxiii).

⁴ Cf. ASSEMANNI, I., i, xxii; MÜNTZ, *loc. cit.*, 92 *seq.* For F. Sabeo, see FICHARD, *Italia*, 48, where there is also a good description, hitherto overlooked by all students, including Müntz himself, of the state of the library in 1536.

⁵ Matthæus de Varo and Ioh. Honorius (MÜNTZ, *loc. cit.*, 99, 101; cf. LEGRAND, *Bibl. Hellénique*, I., cxiv *seq.*; NOLHAC, Orsini, 162 *seq.*).

⁶ LEGRAND, I., clxxi, clxxvi, cxc, cxciv, ccxvi, 220, 249, 258, 265; II., 55; see also NOLHAC, 160 *seq.*; Cod. MSS. Palat. graeci Bibl. Vat., 181.

⁷ See MÜLLER in *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, I., 337.

Manutius, he acquired the type in which from 1542 onwards the commentaries of Eustathios on Homer began to appear in Rome.¹ In the years 1548–1549 an Æthiopic translation of the New Testament was also printed in Rome.²

Generous in all things, the Pope also lent repeatedly to scholars precious works from his own private library or employed his influence to obtain for them from foreign collections the use of rare manuscripts.³ In this connection mention ought also to be made of the very many privileges of printing by which Paul III. advanced the labours of *litterati* and scholars of every description.⁴

The number of works not only in Italian but also in German⁵ and French⁶ dedicated, in print or manuscript, to the Farnese Pope is exceptionally large. Many have been already cited; to go through the list of all would overpass the limits of this history.⁷ Suffice it to observe that the

¹ Cf. DOREZ in *Mél. d'archéol.*, XII., 289 *seq.*; see LEGRAND, I., 265, and CIAN in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, IX., 455, n. 3. For A. Bladus, see BERNONI, A. Blado, Ascoli, 1883; the same, *Dei Torresani, Blado et Ragazzoni*, Milano, 1890; FUMAGALLI-BELLI, *Cat. d. ediz. Romane di A. Blado*, Roma, 1891.

² See GUIDI, in *Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, IX., 273 *seq.*; for the "Tasfa Sion" here mentioned, see POLLIDORUS, *Vita Marcelli*, II., 71 *seq.*

³ Cf. QUIRINI, *Imago*, 3 *seq.*

⁴ The evidence in the *Min. brev. of the Secret Archives of the Vatican is so copious that it must be reserved for publication in another place.

⁵ Thus by Faber (see Vol. XI. of this work, p. 94, n. 1), Nausea (see MESSNER'S Monograph, 76, 77), Eck (RAYNALDUS, 1536, n. 39), Cochläus (see *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 265), and others.

⁶ Here belongs the *Martini Brionaei Parisiens. *Descriptio totius terrae sanctae*. Cod. Vat., 5536 (Vatican Library).

⁷ Cf. in general CIACONIUS, III., 544, 553, 556. Of the unpublished works are still to be mentioned: *Cod. Vat., 3676: *Libellus de reformat. civit. Perusinae symbolice descriptus*; 3718: *A. Lippomanni Apologia primatus Petri et successorum* (Vatican Library).

theological works preponderate over those of a purely literary character. The golden age of the Renaissance was over, and the theological works dedicated to Paul III. are almost all part of the great armoury used against the Protestant reformers.¹ Even where this is not the case the authors, for the most part, are indirectly interested in the events of the time, principally in the Council, the centre on which so many hopes turned.²

Among the dedications of works of another sort that of Nicolas Copernicus, in his treatise *On the Revolution of the Heavens*, cannot be passed over. The fame of the remarkable investigations of the founder of the new astronomy had reached Rome early. In 1533 Albrecht Widmanstetter had already expounded to Clement VII. in the gardens of the Vatican the new system of the universe.³ If not at that time, Paul III. was certainly later on informed on the subject by Cardinal Schönberg, who in 1536 asked Copernicus for a copy of his life's work. The latter was advised by Tiedemann Giese, Bishop of Culm, to dedicate his epoch-making treatise to Paul III. In his dedication he observes that even in the remote corner of the earth in which he lived the Pope stood high in men's estimation, and that his authority and judgment would easily put to silence the tongue of calumny. "If I am not altogether deceived," Copernicus wrote further, "it appears to me that this work of mine may even be of use to the general well-

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 540 *seq.* More writings referring to this subject will be dealt with by LAUCHERT in his "Luthers Italienische Gegner."

² See specially the writing of the General of the Servites, Augustinus de Aretio: **Conversio Pauli*, in Cod. Vat., 3638 (original dedication copy).

³ Cf. VON BRAUNMÜHL, *Kopernikus und sein Weltsystem* (1896). For Johann Albrecht Widmanstetter and his relations to Paul III., see the monograph of M. MÜLLER (Bamberg, 1908), pp. 26, 29.

being of the Church, the supreme government of which is in thy hands."

While many Protestant theologians, with Luther, who called Copernicus a fool, and even the highly cultivated Melanchthon, at their head, strenuously opposed the new system as at variance with the Bible, the epoch-making treatise of the Dean of Frauenburg was able to make its appearance in print in 1543 with the dedication to Paul III. at its commencement.¹

II.

The importance of Paul III. as a patron of literature was on a different plane from that which he occupied as a patron of art. Here he has been spoken of as the last great Pope of the Renaissance.² This, perhaps, is an exaggeration. He cannot be compared with the great patrons of art and literature of the golden age, although in energy and breadth of view he recalls, in many respects, Julius II.³ However this may be, in spite of the great difficulties of the situation, he put forth all his energies to preserve for the Holy See the intellectual primacy of former days in the domain of art. It is only when we call to mind that, at the time of his accession, the palmy days had passed

¹ See PROWE, *N. Koppernikus*, I., 2, Berlin, 1883, 495 *seq.*; HIPLER, *N. Koppernikus und M. Luther*, Braunsberg, 1868; MÜLLER, *N. Koppernikus*, Freiburg, 1898; JANSSEN-PASTOR, III., 18th ed., 330 *seq.*; COSTANZI, *La chiesa e le dottrine Copernicane*, 2nd ed., Siena, 1898, 103 *seq.*, 109 *seq.*; WILLMANN, *Gesch. d. Idealismus*, III., 59 *seq.*; GIGALSKI, *N. Koppernikus*, Allenstein, 1907. KRAUS (Dante, 754) calls attention to the acceptance by Paul III. of Vellutello's edition of the *Divine Comedy* (1544).

² SALZA in *Giorn. d. lett. Ital.*, XLIII., 200.

³ That he surpassed Julius II., as H. Borgia in his **epigram, *De Pauli P. M. aedificiis* (Cod. Barb. lat., 1903, f. 38 of the Vatican Library) implies, is an exaggeration.

away, and cast into the scales the profound after-effects of the sack, that we can reach a right point of view from which to appreciate the richness of the after-summer ushered in for Italian art through the influence of this energetic and cultivated man. The character of transition with which his whole pontificate was stamped is here also plainly visible. He stands on the borderland of greatness and decline. Even in the best art of his reign the downward steps can be traced; simplicity and originality were vanishing with the rays of the golden age. Nevertheless, the determined and indefatigable Pope, who knew how to reassemble in Rome the artists of the Medicean era and to give in the most varied ways an impulse to their hands, shed on art itself a lustre which radiated far and wide. For Raphael, the unique, Paul III. could indeed find no substitute, but on the greatest of all the surviving masters, Michael Angelo, he bestowed a higher appreciation and finer opportunities for the exercise of his genius than either of the two preceding Popes had done.¹

The Pope found it no easy matter to capture the Titans. Shortly after the death of Clement VII. Michael Angelo had returned to Rome, and wished now, as his biographer Condivi relates, to devote himself to the completion of the monument to Julius II. To undertake other engagements, to entangle himself in a fresh position of dependency, lay so far from his thoughts—he was now on the verge of old age—that, when the news reached him that the new Pope wished to give him an appointment in his household, he was terror-struck. He held himself therefore aloof from the court. But Paul III. found out the way to reach him, to allay his scruples, and to enlist him in his service. “For thirty years,” he is reported to have said, “I have longed

¹ This opinion of REUMONT (III., 2, 716, 728), given in 1870, has been fully confirmed by later research.

to employ you, and now that I am Pope shall I deny myself the fulfilment of my wish?" When Michael Angelo appealed to his obligations in the matter of the Julian monument, the Pope rejoined: "Where is the deed of agreement? I will tear it up."¹ These words fit in well with the visit which Paul III., with a brilliant retinue of Cardinals and prelates, paid the artist in his modest house at Macel de' Corvi,² near the column of Trajan. In the studio the Pope inspected works for the tomb of the Rovere Pope and the sketch for the Last Judgment which Clement VII. had already ordered for the Sistine Chapel.³

Michael Angelo was unable to withstand the strong will of Paul III. and his unwonted marks of distinction. He yielded, and entered Farnese's service. The latter, with his statesmanlike perception, knew well that great work is best done by those who are equipped with full authority and responsibility.⁴ He therefore created for the master a position second to none in dignity, influence, and advantages. By a brief of the 1st of September 1535 he took Michael Angelo into his household, appointed him chief architect, sculptor, and painter of the Vatican Palace, and assigned to him for the execution of the Last Judgment a lifelong salary of 1200 ducats.⁵ No other

¹ See Condivi, ed. FREY, 150; STEINMANN, *Sixtina*, II., 480.

² Cf. STEINMANN, II., 469 *seq.*; LANCIANI, *Renaissance*, 185 *seq.*

³ See our statements, Vol. X. of this work, 363.

⁴ JUSTI, *Michelangelo*, 322.

⁵ The brief first published by CANCELLIERI (*Descriz. delle capelle pontif.*, Roma, 1790, 82 *seq.*) is best given by POGATSCHER in Steinmann, II., 742 *seq.*, from the draft in Secret Archives of the Vatican; there also is the second brief of Sept. 1, 1535, on the bestowal of the *Passus Padi* on Piacenza. This source of income was repeatedly a matter of dispute, and after Pier Luigi's murder was entirely absorbed by the Imperial chancery. Paul compensated Michael Angelo with the revenues of a chancery in Rimini (see FREY, *Briefe*, 343, 349).

engagement was henceforward to hinder his services to the Head of the Church, who in his brief described him as not only equalling but surpassing in the range of his ability and understanding the ancient masters of his crafts. A *motu proprio* of the 17th of November 1536 declared Michael Angelo to be immune from all prosecution, loss, or damage on the part of the heirs of Julius II., since he had been compelled to work, as before for Clement VII. so now for Paul III., and to finish the Last Judgment.¹

Together with these important works he was soon entrusted with other tasks. Paul III. deserves all recognition in that he also restrained in this respect his pronounced family feeling. The construction of the Farnese palace certainly went on, but became a secondary consideration in the presence of great undertakings of service to the city and the Church.² The new commissions with which Michael Angelo was entrusted gave him a brilliant pre-eminence over not only the painters but the architects of his day.

Among the numerous masters of construction employed by Paul III.³ there were two only who could compete with Michael Angelo: Antonio da Sangallo and Baldassare Peruzzi. The latter, who already had acted as architect

¹ This document also was first given by CANCELLIERI (*loc. cit.*, 85 *seq.*), and recently in an improved form by POGATSCHER (*loc. cit.*, 748 *seq.*).

² JUSTI, Michelangelo, 322, remarks: "This is another instance to show that art often fares better under an able politician than under a self-opinionated dilettante" (*cf.* MACKOWSKY, 231).

³ Antonio Abbaco, Vignola, Serlio, Baronino da Casale, Galeazzo Alessi and many others mentioned in the accounts of Paul III. The Pope's account-books have been repeatedly made use of for artistic references (*cf.* POGATSCHER in Steinmann, II., 763 *seq.*), but they still yield much new information. Many extracts made by Müntz have been kindly placed at my disposal by Baron v. Geymüller.

on the reconstruction of St. Peter's¹ under Leo X. and Clement VII., was confirmed in that honourable post as early as the 1st of December 1534 and his yearly stipend of² 150 gold gulden doubled. The chief oversight of the works on the Basilica of St. Peter's remained in the hands of Antonio da Sangallo, who had been entrusted with this commission by Leo X. on the death of Raphael. To Clement VII. Sangallo was also indebted for his appointment as chief architect of Ancona and of Loreto. Paul III., who as Cardinal had³ often already employed and conferred marks of distinction on Sangallo, confirmed him on the 28th of May 1536 in these appointments and named him at the same time to be architect of all buildings in the Papal States, with an annual salary to a total of 720 ducats.⁴ From these hitherto unknown stipendial arrangements it is clear that Michael Angelo took from the beginning the first place among the artists employed by Paul III. Friction certainly was not always absent. Peruzzi died in the beginning of January 1537, but Sangallo lived on and worked indefatigably up to the autumn of 1546. He was repeatedly in collision with Michael Angelo, and this was specially the case over the vast plans for the fortification of Rome, which the Pope had projected for the security of the city.

It had long been believed that the motive of the Pope's defensive enterprise was a dread of the recurrence of the appalling disaster which had befallen his predecessor :

¹ See our statements, Vol. VIII. of this work, 367, and Vol. X., 352, 508.

² See the text of the hitherto unknown brief in Appendix No. 1 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. *Atti Mod.*, II., 471 *seq.*

⁴ See the text of the *Document, also unknown, in Appendix No. 2 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

the capital of the Church should in future be protected against such assaults as those delivered by Colonna and Bourbon.¹ Paul III., who had lived through those terrible experiences, was certainly not uninfluenced by such considerations, but his chief reason was another. Since the year 1537 the peril of a Turkish invasion had become ever more menacing. All Italy trembled,² and Rome seemed insufficiently secured against a sudden descent of Turkish pirates. Fichard, the jurist of Frankfort, visited Rome in the autumn of 1537 and remarked that the towers of the old walls of Aurelian had in many places fallen in altogether or were threatening to come down.³ Here repairs were to be made, and that in the most thorough manner.

The earlier Popes of the Renaissance had, as their armorial shields and inscriptions show to this day, been satisfied with the partial restoration of some of the most badly damaged portions of the vast circuit of the walls. With such repairs Paul III. was not satisfied. A huge system of new fortifications, based on all the resources at the disposal of the modern art of military engineering, was to secure once and for all the entire city on both sides of the Tiber. Long and minute deliberations, in which the Pope and Pier Luigi Farnese took part in person, were held with the most competent architects, engineers, and generals of experience. The result was the acceptance of the plans which Antonio da Sangallo, the heir of a great name and a long tradition, had produced. If this project were fully carried out, Rome was bound to become the best fortified city in the world. Sangallo, to whom under

¹ Thus REUMONT (III., 2, 718), and more recently MACKOWSKY (p. 313). The Dominican GUGLIELMOTTI (*Fortificazioni*, 320 *seq.*) in 1880 was the first to take the right view of all these matters.

² See our statements, Vol. XI. of this work, p. 261 *seq.*

³ See FICHARD, *Italia*, 16.

Clement VII. the erection of defences had been entrusted in Florence, Ancona, and many other parts of the Papal States, was appointed director of works.¹ Paul III. had had previous experience of his excellency as a military architect before his own election to the Papacy and afterwards in 1534 when the works at Ancona were being strengthened.

How seriously Sangallo undertook his task can be seen from the drawings and plans preserved in the Uffizi in Florence. The most recent investigation has, in a manner deserving of gratitude, made these precious sheets accessible to all by means of copies.²

According to Sangallo's thoughtfully considered plan a strong continuous wall with no less than eighteen powerful bastions was to encompass the whole city. Further, on the meadows north of St. Angelo and on the opposite end near the Lateran two citadels of great size were to be placed. The walls of Aurelian were, it was intended, to be retained on the whole. Only in two places was a narrowing of the area of the city, otherwise far too much spread out, projected; on the Aventine the course of the Servian walls was to be followed, and also the district of Testaccio excluded. From the Pincian, which Sangallo intended to supply with two bastions, one on the site of the later Villa Medici and another towards the Piazza del Popolo, a new exterior wall was to be drawn from the

¹ Cf. the brief of Jan. 1, 1538, first published by MÜNTZ in the Rev. Archéol., VIII., 329, and afterwards by CLAUSSE (II., 340 *seq.*) and ROCCHI (p. 230 *seq.*). See also in Appendix No. 5 the brief of Jan. 14, 1538 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Besides Hülsen's excellent articles in the Bull. d. Ist. Arch. Germ., IX. (1894), 328 *seq.*, cf. the great publication of ROCCHI: *Le piante iconografiche*, 175 *seq.*, and the accompanying Atlas, 29-49; see also RAVIOLI, *Notizie sui lavori di architett. milit. dei nove Sangallo*, 13 *seq.*; MÜNTZ in the Rev. Archéol., VIII., 321 *seq.*

present Via della Croce to the mausoleum of Augustus, inclosing the latter in the line of defence. At St. Angelo Sangallo wished to give fresh supports to the outworks of Alexander VI.

Romolo Amaseo, in his funeral oration, said that the old Pope could not have hoped to see so vast an undertaking completed during his pontificate, but he had entered upon it with a stout heart and left a good example to his successors.¹ From the accounts in the Roman archives, unfortunately in incomplete preservation, it can be inferred what a great number of architects and engineers were employed to carry out this mighty plan. Among them were Antonio's brother Giovan Battista, nicknamed "Il Gobbo," and Giovanni Mangone, the builder of the palace of Cardinal Armellini in Perugia. The office of commissary-general of the fortifications was given to Prospero Mochi, who supplied Pier Luigi Farnese during his frequent absences from Rome with continuous information by letter as to the progress of the works. The celebrated military architect Francesco de' Marchi was also employed in marking out the sites.²

The works, in the course of which numerous and important fragments of antiquity were brought to light,³

¹ AMASAEUS, 77.

² See ROCCHI, 225 *seqq.*, 250 *seqq.*, FR. DE MARCHI, *Architett. Milit.*, ed. L. Marini, Roma, 1810; VENTURI, *Vita e opere di Fr. Marchi*, Milano, 1816; BORGATTI in the *Riv. di artiglieria*, XVI., 391; GUGLIELMOTTI, *Fortificazioni*, 323; the will of P. Mochi in GORI, *Archivio*, VI., 111 *seqq.* *G. M. della Porta mentions the summoning of a "Fra da Modena" in connection with the fortifications on Sept. 21, 1537 (State Archives, Florence). Mochi's house still stands (*cf.* ADINOLFI, *Canale*, 20) in the Via Coronari, No. 148; on the windows is the inscription: P. de Mochis Abbr. Ap.; over the entrance: Tua puta que tute facis.

³ See LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 98 *seq.*

had, according to the evidence of the accounts, been begun in the autumn of 1537. Commencements were made simultaneously at S. Saba and at the Porta Ardeatina.¹ On the south-western slope of the Aventine is still to be seen, on the bastion of Paul III., looking down on the Via della Marmorata which leads to the Porto S. Paolo, a white marble shield, unfortunately very much damaged, bearing the arms of the Farnese Pope, the work of a Florentine sculptor named Lorenzo. This bastion is well known to every visitor to Rome by the name of La Colonnella: the whole, crowned by a summer-house of later construction, had formerly a more picturesque character, when the new building of S. Anselmo had not yet arisen in the background.²

Contemporaneously with the works on the Aventine the process of safeguarding the line of wall between the Porta S. Paolo and the Porta S. Sebastiano was taken in hand. The walls of Aurelian were here in ruins along an extent of 400 metres. Four colossal bastions were to render this spot impregnable in the future. The complete construction of one only occupied the interval between 1537 and 1542; it arose about midway between the above-named gates, near the ancient Porta Ardeatina; this bastion, called "Antoniana," from the Baths of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Caracalla lying to the rear, is still standing. It stands out in very clear relief against the old walls on which it abuts. The lofty masonry is divided by a course of stonework

¹ See ROCCHI, 248. The *Ephem. in Cod. Vat., 6978, give the date 1537: "Per totum hunc Augusti mensem fuerunt Romae sex mille pedites Itali et incoepa est fortificatio urbis" (Vatican Library).

² The bastion La Colonnella belongs to the Benedictines of S. Anselmo, who ordered the casemates to be filled up in 1905. The payment for "Mastro Lorenzo di Ludovico scultore fiorentino" in GORI, Archivio, VI., 223.

into two portions, the lesser one above and the larger one below. In the wide embrasures, from which the guns could discharge their fire from the front and laterally, thick bushes now grow. High up on the southernmost projection the armorial lilies of the Farnesi, crowned by the tiara and keys, are introduced. On the left side of this richly decorated remnant of 16th-century sculpture, the gleaming white marble of which shines far across the Campagna, a place has been found for the arms, on a smaller scale, of the Roman Senate and people.¹

The buildings aforesaid cost not less than 44,000 ducats, raised partly by an impost on grain.² It can easily be calculated that if the works were to proceed at this rate neither the reign of the aged Pope nor the money at his disposal would suffice to complete the fortification of the vast mural circuit of the city on the left bank of the Tiber. A practical head such as that of Paul III. could not fail to perceive that the gigantic scheme of Sangallo far exceeded the capacities of the State exchequer. He therefore decided to fall back upon the idea of Nicolas V.³ and to confine the fortifications to the Leonine city; there, in case of necessity, the inhabitants of the left bank also could find a refuge.⁴

The works on the Aventine and at the Porta Ardeatina were therefore suspended.⁵ Although unfinished they form

¹ On the right side was the small shield, surrounded by lilies, of the Cardinal-Camerlengo Guido Ascanio Sforza. The Papal coat of arms is more beautifully executed and better preserved than on the Aventine. There is a very unsatisfactory picture of the bastion in CLAUSSÉ, II., 337; a better in the periodical *The Emporium*, XXIII. (1906), 295.

² ROCCHI, 249. For the tax, see also DITTRICH, *Contarini*, 348

³ Cf. our statements, Vol. II. of this work, pp. 173, 175.

⁴ Cf. JOVIUS, *Hist.*, l. 43.

⁵ The works at the Porta Ardeatina, where the bastion Antoniana was to be completely finished, were begun in 1542; the works on the

a remarkable specimen of Italian military architecture of the 16th century, which, unfortunately, is now being left to fall in part into a disgraceful state of decay,¹

The fortification of the Leonine city, decided upon in November 1542,² was begun on April the 18th, 1543, and carried on without interruption up to the Pope's death.³ The two citadels which were to have risen on the "Prati" in the neighbourhood of the present Palace of Justice were not begun immediately, as on this side the fortress of St. Angelo appeared to give sufficient protection. Sangallo therefore concentrated his energies between 1543 and 1545 principally on the weak side of the Borgo where, between the Vatican and the Janiculum, the Monte di S. Spirito rises. Three bastions (del Fiume, di Santo Spirito, and degli Incoronati) were here erected, since at this point the danger of a Turkish attack had again to be taken into consideration. The Pope wished the works to proceed with the utmost possible expedition.⁴ It was

Colonnella bastion had already been suspended in September 1539; in January of the same year work at S. Saba had been discontinued (see ROCCHI, 248).

¹ The complaints of ROCCHI (p. 356 *seq.*), and of LANCIANI after him (Scavi, II., 100), in this respect have only too much justification, but no result was obtained. The precious inheritance of ages was cast away in order to squander money on monuments of unknown size in modern Rome.

² This hitherto unknown date is established by N. Sernini's report of Nov. 16, 1542, in SOLMI, Ochino, 55. Cf. also L. Tolomei's *report, dat. Rom., Dec. 10, 1542, in which it says: "S. B^{no} ha ordinato che il S. Aless. Vitelli venga per dare il disegno a la fortificatione del palazzo et del Borgo" (State Archives, Siena).

³ Cf. ROCCHI, 259 *seq.*, 277 *seq.* The sum paid for the works on the right bank is here reckoned at 35,000 scudi. ADRIANI (I., 257) mentions the taxes raised for the purpose.

⁴ See the *A. Serristori's *reports of May 21 and 31 and June 3, 1544, and that of Babbi of June 14, 1544. In the *letter of May 21 it

therefore all the more vexatious for him that, during the consultations about the fortifications held under the presidency of Alessandro Vitelli, Michael Angelo in February 1545 had violent altercations, first with Giovanni Francesco Montemellino, and at the end of the same year with Sangallo. Michael Angelo thought that he was justified in asserting himself all the more positively since his measures for protecting the bastions on the hill of San Miniato during the siege of Florence in 1529 had conferred upon him great reputation. As Sangallo was not less obstinate in maintaining his position, the Pope was at last compelled to impose silence on both the disputants.¹ This squabble protracted the works, and in all probability was the cause of the monumental Porta di S. Spirito, an arch of triumph rather than the gate of a fortress, remaining in an unfinished state.² The bastions, however, near S. Spirito, which now bear Sangallo's name, reflect high honour on their architect both from their size and their admirable position.³ Sangallo continued up to his death

says: "La fortificatione di Borgo si sollecita a furia facendosi li bastioni di terra, dove sono a lavorare 2000 homini"; in *that of June 3: "La fortificatione del Borgo si sollecita più che mai et S. S^{ta} dice che vuole sia finita per tutto quello mese, ma non è possibile; basta che si tira innanzi gagliardamente" (State Archives, Florence).

¹ Cf. VASARI, VII., 216 *seq.*; GOTTI, I., 295 *seq.*; II., 126 *seq.*; THODE, I., 442, 445; GEYMÜLLER, Michelangelo als Architekt, 52-55. RAVIOLI (p. 27) places the quarrel between Michael Angelo and Sangallo in the year 1542, GUGLIELMOTTI (Fortificazioni, 352) and ROCCHI (p. 279) in the last months of 1545.

² See VASARI, VII., 217; MÜNTZ, Antiquités de Rome, 144. The drawing of Sangallo's projected Porta di S. Spirito in CLAUSSE, II., 353; *ibid.*, 346, a good representation of the bastion of S. Spirito.

³ ROCCHI (p. 50) calls it a wonderful specimen of the Cinquecento art of fortification.

[the 29th of September 1546] at the head of the works.¹ He was followed by Jacopo Meleghino, who, as long as Paul III. lived, enjoyed the title and salary of a chief architect of fortifications, although he was not equal to his situation. The Pope was aware of this; he therefore recommended his favoured servant to follow in all questions of importance the opinion of Michael Angelo, who, although by right subordinate to Meleghino, now became practically the leading architect, and under his direction the Belvedere bastion was completed between 1547 and 1548.² This construction, still in good repair, would be more imposing if the Vatican and St. Peter's did not absorb the attention of the spectator. Here, as on the other bastions, a gigantic coat of arms proclaims the glory of Farnese.

After the completion of the Belvedere, which protects what is perhaps the most precious possession of the Popes, their collection of antiquities, Michael Angelo retired and the leadership fell once more to the constructor of the fortifications of Sermoneta, Jacopo Fusti Castriotto of Urbino. Up to the death of Paul III. his labours for the security of the Leonine city³ were unremitting. There was indeed need

¹ On Sept. 12, 1546, Sangallo had already received a month's payment of 25 scudi on his salary as architect of the fortifications (ROCCHI, 265).

² Thus ROCCHI (p. 279 *seq.*), following the accounts. The inscription on the Belvedere bastion, with the date 1542 (see FORCELLA, XIII., 31, n. 16), certainly disagrees with this. Here is no printer's error. The inscription, as I saw myself, has plainly : A. VIII. Since, however, there is a payment for the coat of arms of June 5, 1547, GUGLIELMOTTI (Fortificazioni, 365) expects that VIII. instead of XIII.=1547 was carved by mistake on the stone. RONCHINI treats the question of J. Meleghino fully in the *Atti Mod.*, IV., 125 *seq.* See also GUGLIELMOTTI, 356 *seq.*; BERTELOTTI, *Art. Bolog.*, 20 *seq.*; LANCIANI, *Renaissance*, 164 *seq.*; FONTANA, II., 493 *seq.*

³ *Cf.* GUGLIELMOTTI, 369 *seq.*; ROCCHI, 40 *seq.*, 282; PROVASI, Jacopo Fusti Castriotto, Urbino, 1901.

for despatch, for since the murder of Pier Luigi and the occupation of Piacenza by the Imperialists the political situation had assumed a menacing aspect.¹ Nothing therefore could have been worse than a renewal of dissensions. Castriotto wished to carry the bastions along the ridge of the hill, but this aroused the opposition of the Perugian, Francesco Montemellino, who proposed to construct the works at its foot. At the consultation held under the presidency of Ottavio Farnese, Castriotto at last carried the day and now began to throw a huge line of defences round the Vatican hill. The site of the bastions was already mapped out, and the line of walls marked by fascines and earth-works, when the Pope died. The plan of fortification for the Janiculum now also came to a standstill.²

The protection of his native city was not the only pre-occupation of the Pope. He was deeply concerned for its beauty, comfort, and healthiness. One of the first acts of his reign was the appointment of a commissary to take charge of the antiquities of Rome; the first to exercise this function was Latino Giovenale Manetti, whose ordinances were supported by ecclesiastical penalties. In the brief of nomination of the 28th of November 1534 it says: "Not without deep sorrow are we aware that not merely Goths, Vandals, and other barbarians, not merely Greeks and the ravages of time, but our own indifference and guilt, our greed and cunning have torn down, destroyed, and squandered the venerable adornments of the city of the Quirites. We are burdened with the thought that briars, ivy, and other plants have taken root in the ancient

¹ See *supra*, pp. 433, 444.

² See ROCCHI, 51, 60, 200 *seq.*, 282 *seq.*; GUGLIELMOTTI, Fortificazioni, 371 *seq.*; RONCHINI, Il Montemellino da Perugia e le fortificazioni di Roma; Giorn. d. erudiz. artist., I., Perugia, 1872.

buildings and split asunder the masonry, that small dwellings and shops cluster round the monuments and mar their beauty, and, last and worst of all, that statues, pictures, brazen and marble tables, objects of porphyry, Numidian and other marbles have been carried out of the city and dispersed among strangers." Manetti is then extolled for his love of Rome and enthusiasm in exploring for ancient remains. To him is entrusted the care of the monuments of the city and its environs, so that all statues, inscriptions, and marbles shall be, as far as possible, preserved, stripped of briars and ivy, and kept clear of contact with new buildings, nothing broken to pieces or burned to make lime or removed from the city.¹

Manetti unfortunately was often absent from Rome on political missions.² This, and still more the circumstance that the deeper appreciation of the remains of antiquity was a thing of slow development, were the causes why the ruins of the city continued just as before to be convenient quarries from which to extract marble and travertine, notwithstanding the ordinance of Paul III. As the science of antiquity was then in its infancy, more harm was done than anyone dreamed of. The laying down of the triumphal way for Charles V. had already damaged many monuments in the Forum, where in 1539, and especially in 1540, at the very moment when Manetti was absent on two missions to France, the search for materials for the rebuilding of St. Peter's was carried on with barbarism. Nor in the following years was the monstrous practice discontinued here or in other places.³ Paul III. was an

¹ MARINI, *Archiatr.*, II., 280.

² Cf. our statements *supra*, p. 537 *seq.*

³ See HÜLSEN in *Bullett. d. Ist. Germ.*, III., 208 *seq.*; LANCIANI, II., 184 *seqq.* The latter (*Ancient Rome*, 276) describes the period from 1540 to 1549 as ruinous to the Roman Forum.

accomplice in these acts of destruction, since on the 22nd of July 1540 he gave permission to the deputies of the *Fabbrica* of St. Peter's to dig everywhere inside and outside the city for blocks of marble and travertine as well as for pillars.¹ Here again is an example of the contradictory elements at work in this transitional period of the Papacy. The brief of 1534 announced a new epoch, that of 1540 denoted a relapse into the groove of a bad old custom—a custom which henceforward would grow stronger in proportion to the growth in building activity. Even if many inscriptions and architectural pieces have been preserved as the ornaments of palace courts and gardens, yet the great majority of the finds were wantonly made use of as building material or flung into the limekiln. It was an exception to the rule when, in 1546, the Consular and Triumphal Fasti found near the Regia in the Forum escaped this fate; it was Cardinal Farnese who rescued this important discovery from destruction. The Fasti were discovered by Bartolommeo Marliano and a worthy and secure resting-place was found for them in the Palace of the Conservatori.²

Besides being commissary of antiquities Manetti, together with Angelo del Bufalo de' Cancellieri, and afterwards with Girolamo Maffei, held the post of overseer of streets. Under them was the famous architect Bartolommeo Baronino, who in 1554 fell a victim to a murderous assault.³ The

¹ Text of the brief in *Rev. Archéol.*, 1884, III., 308 *seq.*

² See HÜLSEN, *Forum Romanum, Romae*, 1904, 34 *seq.*; *Corp. Inscript.*, I.,² I *seq.*; GYRALDUS, *De Poetis*, ed. Wotke, Berolini, 1894, 58 *seq.*; *Atti Mod.*, VI., 207 *seq.*; LANCIANI, II., 197; *cf.* also DRUFFEL, *Mon. Trid.*, I., 454.

³ BERTOLOTI, *Bartol. Baronino*, Casale, 1876, 10 *seq.*; see also *Art. Subalp.*, 29 *seq.* Baronino died on Sept. 6, 1554, as his epitaph, still preserved in the Chapel of S. Joseph in the Pantheon, informs us (see FORCELLA, I., 296; *cf.* LANCIANI, *Renaissance*, 172).

first task imposed on these officials was the formation of the triumphal way commanded by the Pope on the occasion of the visit of Charles V. The route lay from the Porta S. Sebastiano through the Via S. Gregorio over the Forum, and thence by the Salita di Marforio to the Piazza di San Marco and the Via Papale. In the course of this swiftly executed work many dwelling-houses were pulled down, several churches, and a mass of antique ruins. The debris was used to fill up the depression in the ground between the Arches of Titus and Severus.¹

The works of the year 1536 were the prelude to many others of the same kind. Rome, that under the rule of Paul III. gradually underwent renewal, was, with regard to the condition of the streets, far behind the rest of the great cities of Italy. How little they became a great capital was shown by this very visit of the Emperor just mentioned. Paul III., by his numerous street regulations and remedial measures, introduced a new epoch in which Rome divested herself more and more of her mediæval traits and assumed an appearance more in keeping with the artistic creations of the Renaissance, her own dignity as chief city of the world, and the requirements of her multifarious traffic.

Paul III. left no stone unturned to better the condition of the Roman streets, in which respect he was a forerunner of Sixtus V. Demolitions thus became necessary to such an extent that at last house-rents rose considerably.² As early as 1538 he had begun to improve and beautify the Via Lata and the Corso: first of all the length of way between the Piazza di S. Marco and the so-called Arco di

¹ See Vol. XI. of this work, p. 242.

² Cf. A. Serristori's *report of July 16, 1548 (State Archives, Florence). A description of the church demolished after the Emperor's visit in Appendix No. 4 (Vatican Library).

Portogallo, which at that time still spanned the street near to the Palazzo Fiano; afterwards he proceeded with the last portion, on which there were as yet few buildings as far as the Piazza del Popolo. As these schemes involved a large expenditure of money, he raised a special tax upon the owners of such houses as rose in value in consequence of the improvements.¹ The accounts also show the amounts given in compensation for the necessary expropriations, which were carried out on a strictly regulated system.

The street already constructed under the Medicean Popes from the Piazza del Popolo to the piazza lying below the Trinità de' Monti, the later Via del Babuino, was improved and renamed after the reigning Pontiff, Via Paolina. In 1541 the Piazza Navona was connected with the Piazza Apollinare. In the following year two new arteries of traffic, starting from the bridge of St. Angelo, were opened: the Via di Panico and the Via Paola. In the Borgo the Via Alessandrina was widened and paved. In the city on the left bank of the Tiber the open spaces in front of the Farnese palace and of the palaces of S. Marco and SS. Apostoli were laid out, an alteration of the highest importance for the healthiness of this narrow and winding quarter; the draining of the swampy ground about the Vatican served the same sanitary purpose.² Numerous other streets date back to the days of Paul III.: the Via di S. Maria in Monticelli, di Torre Argentina, de' Baulari, dei Cestari, della Palombella, della Trinità (now Via Fontanella di Borghese and Condotti), and del Foro Trajano; the clearance of the ground round the column of Trajan and the erection of the colossal figures of Castor

¹ See LANCIANI, *La Via del Corso*: Bull. Comun., XXX. (1902), 229 *seq.*; *cf.* LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 236, and *Renaissance*, 112 *seq.*

² *Cf.* AMASAEUS, 75 *seq.*

and Pollux on the Quirinal are also due to the solicitude of this Pontiff.¹

The inscription on the noble marble statue placed in his honour in 1543 in the great hall of the Senatorial Palace justly celebrates his zealous endeavours to beautify, by the improvement and construction of streets and piazzas, the thoroughfares of Rome, hitherto disfigured by narrow alleys and projecting buildings.²

The reconstruction of the Capitol, as well as the regular-

¹ LANCIANI, Scavi, II., 228-236; Bullett. d. Ist. Arch., XIII., 262; see also BONANNI, I., 216; ADINOLFI, Canale di Ponte, 52, and Roma, II., 73; ARMELLINI, Chiese, 415; SOLMI, Ochino, 55; Bullett. Comun., XXIX. (1901), 11 *seq.*, 300 *seq.*; N. Arch. Veneto, XIII. (1907), 24. Here also belongs the *payment of Oct. 17, 1547, "magn. d. Io. Petro Cafarello, stratarum alme urbis magistro, duc. auri de camera de paulis 10 pro ducato centum et quinqueginta per ipsum d. Jo. Petrum solvendos Petro Mulioni apud b. Mariam de populo commoranti pro pretio et in satisfactionem cujusdam ipsius Petri domus in loco dicto il borgetto del pedocchio pro via noviter in loco dicto sotto la Trinità fienda dirutae seu de proximo diruendae" (Mand., 1545-1546, f. 56, State Archives, Rome). The inscription of 1543, now vanished, in Via Paolina which spoke of the demolition of thirty-nine houses, is in CIACONIUS, III., 554, and FORCELLA, XIII., 87. For the restoration of the Ponte S. Maria (Ponte Rotto), see FANFANI, Spigolat. Michel, 126 *seq.*; LANCIANI, Renaissance, 160 *seq.*; THODE, V., 211 *seq.* For the restoration on the Ponte Molle and the Ponte Sisto, see *Mand. extraord., 1546-1548, f. 173, and 1548-1549, f. 45, 48 (State Archives, Rome), and Rev. Archéol., IX. (1887), 60. In March 1541 the fountains of the Piazza of S. Peter's were restored (*Mand., 1540-1541, State Archives, Rome).

² FORCELLA, I., 33. The statue (reproduced in STEINMANN, II., 481) has been removed owing to modern arrangements. In 1876 it was set up in the left aisle as a pillar between the second and third chapels of S. Maria in Ara Coeli. LANCIANI (Renaissance, 145) suspects that L. G. Manetti composed the inscription in imitation of one from the antique celebrating similar services rendered by Vespasian.

ization of the streets, was connected with the visit of Charles V. The approach to this eminently historic site was at that time of such a description that the Emperor on his entry was obliged to make a circuit of the hill. From the Forum only one street, from the Arch of Septimius Severus, led up to the Capitol. To the city access was only to be attained by a footpath. That Paul III. should have fixed precisely on the Capitol as the spot to undergo a splendid architectural transformation¹ marks him out as a true-born Roman and also indicates the excellent relations which existed between him and his fellow-citizens. By shedding new lustre on the spot associated with so many recollections of the city's freedom he nipped in the bud, with a dexterous hand, all republican aspirations.

The sketches of a contemporary painter clearly depict the irregular, although picturesque, appearance of the Capitol at the time of Paul III.'s accession. In the background, on the ruins of the ancient Tabularium, rose the fortress-like Palace of the Senators, from the midst of which the crenellated central tower, rising high above the corner turrets, soared aloft. On the right side of the façade, ornamented with the many-coloured coats of arms of the Senators, was the entrance, over which rose a pillared loggia built by Nicolas V. On the steps leading up to it stood a fragment of an ancient marble group, a lion mangling a horse, since 1903 placed in the garden court of the Palace of the Conservatori. Before this image

¹ For what follows, *cf.* VASARI, VII., 222 *seq.*; MICHAELIS in the *Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst.*, 1891, 184 *seq.*; RODOCANACHI, *Le Capitole*, 59 *seq.* The statement of GRIMM (*Michelangelo*, II., 5th ed., 387 *seq.*), that the restoration of the Capitol began with the erection of the flight of steps and that this took place at the time of the entry of Charles V., is entirely wrong.

of retributive vengeance sentences of death were pronounced, to be immediately carried out on the south-western ridge of the hill, then entirely unbuilt upon.¹ This spot, called Monte Caprino from the number of goats which here clambered about, still exhibited remains in Pentelican marble of the famous temple of Jupiter. Many of these blocks were employed on the building of the palace begun in 1545 by Gian Pietro Cafarelli and now the seat of the German embassy. Others, in large quantities, found their way to the new St. Peter's.

On the left side of the piazza, where the Capitoline Museum now stands, just as on the side towards the city, there was a lack of all architectural finish. The view from this point comprised the picturesque southern side of the Franciscan Church of Santa Maria in Aracœli, a small obelisk, and a palm tree the seeds of which had been brought from Palestine by the faithful guardians of the Holy Sepulchre. On the right side lay the Palace of the Conservatori, before the lower pillared arcade of which two colossal marble figures of the river gods Nile and Tigris had been placed. In the arcade itself were also to be seen remains of ancient days: a gigantic bronze head of Domitian and a terrestrial sphere. Above the central arch of the façade, supported on brackets, the famous symbol of Rome, the brazen she-wolf, was displayed, a gift from Sixtus IV., who had also in other ways enriched the Palace of the Conservatori with precious relics of the past.²

¹ From the "Tariffa del Boja," published by GORI (Archivio, III., 297), it is evident that the death-sentence was then carried out at other places as well, *e.g.* on the Piazza of St. Peter's itself; the gibbet stood since 1548 on the space between the bridge of St. Angelo and the prison-house of Torre di Nona.

² Cf. MICHAELIS, *loc. cit.*, 184 *seq.*; HÜLSEN, Bilder aus der Gesch. des Kapitols, Rome, 1889, 7 *seqq.*, 29; THODE, V., 191 *seq.*

In all its special features the Capitol as it then existed was not a match for the chief places of other cities, such as Florence and Siena. In the first place, it received a more artistic centre point, one without an equal in the world. In January 1538 the equestrian bronze statue of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, once entirely gilded over and associated with many a legend, was transferred from the Lateran and set directly in the middle of the piazza in the most effective manner on a block of marble the height of which is admirably proportioned. An inscription on the left side of the base recounts the story of its removal, undertaken by the command of Paul III., notwithstanding the opposition of the Lateran Chapter, in order, as is stated, to perpetuate the memory of the Emperor and to restore the adornment of the city of their fathers.¹ The face of the pedestal bears the beautiful coat of arms of the Farnesi, the back that of the city of Rome, which bore a portion of the cost.

The removal of this famous statue was a starting-point for the complete transformation of the foreground of the Capitol. The plans of Michael Angelo corresponded in the highest degree to the dignity and reputation of the

¹ FORCELLA, I., 33; Arch. d. Soc. Rom., IV., 239. For the statue of M. Aurelius, see ADINOLFI, Roma, II., 250 *seq.*; RODOCANACHI, Capitole, 70 *seq.*; THODE, V., 191; Jahrb. der preuss. Kunstsamml., XXVII., Beiheft 9. The removal of the statue could not have taken place, as has been generally supposed, as late as March 24, 1538, since Blasius de Martinellis *relates already on Jan. 25, 1538: "Post prandium papa venit in Urbem per portam S. Sebastiani et per diversa loca pertransivit una cum cardinalibus videndo novas suas fabricas circa moenia urbis et locum Capitoli noviter explanatum cum aequo [sic!] aeneo Constantini ex Laterano translato in plateam Capitoli; inde per campum Florae et plateam de Farnesio versus Pontem in palatio s. Petri ad aedem suam" (Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 56, f. 570).

spot.¹ A wide, easy flight of steps (*cordonata*) leading up from the Piazza Araceli, and flanked at the top by the great statues of the Dioscuri with their chargers, was to form a new approach and bring the Capitol, which hitherto had been reckoned inferior to the heathen Forum, into direct communication with the Christian city. One ascending this staircase would see before him, according to the plan of the great architect, the splendidly restored Palace of the Senators, and on either side, in a corresponding style of architecture, stately buildings with pillared colonnades, and above them the chief palace crowned with statues. The diagonal position of these lateral palaces was conditioned by the position of the older Palace of the Conservatori. These magnificent buildings led the eye up to the towering mass of the Palace of the Senators which, with its colossal pilasters reaching up through the height of two stories, formed an imposing termination to the composition. This construction, the façade of which concealed the conglomerate style of the older buildings, retained no trace of its earlier fortress-like character save in the battlemented belfry-tower. A wide double staircase merged at the height of the first story into an uncovered balcony adorned with statues, upon which the entrance to the great Senate Hall opened. The monumental character of this noble staircase was enhanced by the fountain extending in front of it. Below the balcony Michael Angelo had intended to place a colossal statue of Jupiter in a niche. At his feet the fountain was to gush forth into a broad basin, and on each side places were to be found for the great statues of the river gods, which hitherto had stood before the Palace of the Conservatori.

¹ VASARI, VII., 222 *seq.*; RODOCANACHI, 65 *seq.*; GEYMÜLLER, Michelangelo als Architekt, 37 *seq.*; RIEGL, Barockkunst, 74 *seq.*; THODE, V., 193 *seq.*

If this great scheme had been completely carried out Rome would have possessed a public place of incomparable beauty and harmony of style. But the misfortune which seemed to haunt so many of the enterprises of Michael Angelo awaited him here also. Financial difficulties, combined with the narrowness of view of the city fathers, stood in the way of the accomplishment of this great project, the features of which are now only known to us through a copper-plate by Etienne du Pérac.¹ After the erection of the statue of Marcus Aurelius, Michael Angelo only survived to see the completion of the stately double staircase in front of the Palace of the Senators. All the rest of the plan was carried out later, on the basis certainly of his drawings but with many important alterations in detail. For the defects then introduced he was in no way responsible; nevertheless, the new Capitol in its entirety, when, after a long period of time, it assumed its present form, displayed the spirit and the genius of its original creator. Despite all the alterations which Giacomo del Duca and Girolamo Rainaldi allowed themselves to indulge in, the whole produces an impression of monumental grandeur which stamps itself ineffaceably on the memory of the beholder.

Paul III. introduced into the Vatican extensive and costly restorations and embellishments,² especially in Bramante's corridor, leading to the Belvedere, begun under Julius II. and now improved and finished. This formed the aged Pope's customary walk when, with the assistance

¹ Cf. MICHAELIS, 187 *seq.*, 190; RODOCANACHI, 78 *seq.*; MAKOWSKY, 317 *seq.*

² See the accounts mentioned by DOREZ (*Bullett. de l'Acad. d. inscript.*, 1905, I., 233), and N. Sernini's report of 1538 in *N. Arch. Veneto*, XIII. (1907), 23 *seq.* Cf. VASARI, V., 465; *Atti Mod.*, II., 476; MÜNTZ, *Bibl. du Vaticane*, 109, 111 *seq.*; **Edif. publ.*, 1541 *seq.*, 1544 *seq.* (State Archives, Rome.)

of two companions, he took his morning exercise.¹ Two most important additions to the Vatican, where, as already mentioned, Jacopo Meleghino had acted since 1537 as commissary-general,² are inseparably associated with the memory of Paul III.: these are the Cappella Paolina and the Sala Regia, which were enthusiastically praised by contemporaries.³

The Sala Regia, intended for the reception of ambassadors of kings and princes, forms a vast antechamber to the Sistine Chapel. The apartment was constructed on the plans of Sangallo, and this involved the destruction of ancient chambers and unfortunately of the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, painted by Fra Angelico for Nicolas V. For the walls and floorings, the ancient ruins of the city, especially those on the Cœlian Hill, supplied a lavish quantity of material. The Sala Regia, certainly the finest chamber in the Papal Palace, begun in 1540, was not finished until 1573. To a later date also belong the historical wall frescoes, one of which, the "Conquest of Tunis," by Zuccherò, refers to the pontificate of Paul III., under whom, also, between 1542 and 1543, Perino del Vaga, Daniele da Volterra, and Jacopo Sansovino

¹ Cf. FICHARD, *Italia*, 50, 71; LANCIANI, *Scavi*, III., 215 *seq.*

² I. Meleghino was from 1537 (not 1538, as RONCHINI states in the *Atti Mod.*, IV., 127) "fabricae sacri palatii apost. commissarius generalis" (see **Tes. seg.*, 1537-1538, f. 109). Meleghino in the following year received very substantial sums "pro expensis fabricae s. palatii": thus on Sept. 4, 1538, 3000 ducats, 1539-1544 on an average 6000 ducats yearly (**Mand.*, 1539-1544, State Archives, Rome). See also RONCHINI, *loc. cit.* Some inscriptions and coats of arms of Paul III., which recall these works, are still preserved (see FORCELLA, VI., 68; BARBIER, *Musées*, 285). Giovanni Mangone, who was engaged at the same time on the Vatican and Belvedere, was not, as has been stated, a Florentine but a Lombard (see BERTOLOTTI, *Art. Lomb.*, I., 58).

³ See AMASAEUS, 75.

executed the exuberant stucco-work of the vast barrel-vaulting of the ceiling, with its noble coffers, winged genii, and gilded escutcheons of the Farnesi in the midst, producing an effect of extreme magnificence. Here, as in other buildings of this Pope, Greek inscriptions are to be found. The painted glass windows of Pastorino da Siena admitted only a subdued light to play upon these decorations in white and gold.¹ The expenses from 1542 to 1549 amounted to not less than 8672 ducats.²

A great scheme of decoration was also undertaken in the Castle of St. Angelo.³ Paul III. gave orders in the first place for enlargement and adornment of the first story of the extremely cramped⁴ Appartamento Papale immediately above the ancient rotunda; his name and escutcheon are repeatedly to be met with in the rooms of this portion of the fortress.⁵

¹ See VASARI, V., 624; PLATNER, II., 238 *seq.*; BARBIER, *Musées*, 86 *seq.*; ARMELLINI, *Chiese*, 785; LETAROUILLY-SIMIL, II., planche 25; BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, 184; BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, *Gesch. der Renaissance*, 211, 356; CLAUSSE, *Sangallo*, II., 362 *seq.*; LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 132 *seq.* The latter has drawn upon the *account books of Paul III. in the Roman State Archives. Some items from them are given in BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 182, 188, 189. A full examination of these sources would require a special monograph to itself. By these *accounts (*cf.* Feb. 14, 1543, and March 10), Jacopo Sansovino's (Jacopus Venetus scultore) share in the work is fully certified. One Guglielmo scultore (probably Della Porta) executed the marble doors in 1546. Daniele da Volterra began to paint in 1548 (BERTOLOTTI, 189, 901); he received 20 ducats monthly (*Edif. publ. 1542-1547, f. 158^b, State Archives, Rome). For Pastorino, see *infra*, p. 608.

² See Edif. publ. 1542-1549, f. 29-30 (State Archives, Rome).

³ See RODOCANACHI, *Le château de Saint-Ange*, Paris, 1909.

⁴ FICHARD (*Italia*, 51) insists on this.

⁵ *Cf.* BORGATTI, 187 *seq.* The inscription of 1546 produced by FORCELLA (XIII., 145, n. 245) is in the Cortile dell' Angelo on the wall

As a counterpart to the Loggia of Julius II. looking towards the city, a second, the Loggia of Paul III., was now built, with decorations in stucco by Girolamo Sermoneta, Pier Antonio Casale, and Raffaello Montelupo.¹ Sangallo afterwards added yet another story to the Appartamento Papale containing a series of roomy chambers, the splendid decoration of which fills every visitor with astonishment. The principal apartment, entered from the Loggia of Julius II. through a tasteful doorway, was named, after its builder, the Sala Paolina or Salone del Consiglio. A whole host of artists, many of them pupils of Raphael, were engaged in decorating these and other rooms in the most magnificent manner. In the accounts the names appear, together with those of Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine, those of Luzio Luzzi, Marco da Siena, and Girolamo Sermoneta. The part assigned to each is difficult of ascertainment. A remarkable feature of the decoration in the Sala Paolina is the rich white and gold stucco-work of the ceiling. It is divided into six rectangles displaying brightly coloured pictures from biblical history, and also adorned with a great variety of groups of amoretto, satyrs, naiads, and garlands of fruit, with Latin and Greek inscriptions; in the centre is displayed in gleaming gold the coat of arms of the Pope. The walls are divided into painted panels, and a cornice with caryatides and bronze-coloured paintings of a mythological and

opposite to the Chapel. A small projecting building, forming the entrance to the fort itself, is also, according to the inscription, of the period of Paul III., whose lilies decorate the frieze (FORCELLA, XIII., 144, n. 253).

¹ VASARI, V., 628 *seq.*; BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 207, and Art. Subalp., 77. The inscription says that this Loggia was finished in 1543 (FORCELLA, XIII., 144, n. 122). In the charming Loggia of Julius II. the Rovere arms were replaced by those of the Farnese!

satyric character supports a row of Ionic pillars; in the smaller spaces between the latter are seen the allegorical figures of justice, fortitude, strength, and wisdom; in the larger, monochrome subjects, surrounded by garlands of fruit, from the history of Alexander the Great. These pictures, under which the forms of genii repose in the bloom of youthful manhood, are the work of Marco da Siena. On the north wall Perino del Vaga has portrayed a full-sized figure of the Archangel St. Michael; on the south wall the Emperor Hadrian, the founder of the castle, while above the doors are allegorical representations of the cardinal virtues.¹

From the Sala Paolina a passage with walls decorated with grotesques in Raphael's charming manner led to a chamber called—on what grounds is not known—the "Bibliotheca." The roof, with the arms of Paul III. in the centre, and the frieze are magnificent specimens of stucco-work, executed by Girolamo Sermoneta from drawings by Perino del Vaga. The paintings representing sea-gods were attributed to Giulio Romano. If not so gorgeous as the ceiling of the Sala Paolina, it is richer and more delicate; especially beautiful are the reliefs in stucco on a gold ground on the frieze.

Finally, there is much ornamentation in two rooms connected with the Sala Paolina, and called after the paintings contained in them. The Chamber of Perseus, which was the dwelling-chamber of Paul III., displays on

¹ Cf. BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 205 *seq.*; BORGATTI in the periodical *Cosmos Catholicus*, 1902, 607, which also contains numerous illustrations. The inscription on the frieze, not given, as far as I know, by Forcella or any other, runs thus: "Quae olim intra hanc arcem collapsa || impedita foedata erant ea nunc a Paula tertio pontifice maximo ad solidam || subtilemve venustatem exstructa disposita ornata conspiciuntur."

its frieze, in four frescoes remarkable for their colour-tone, the history of the demi-god. Below are garlands of fruit with symbolical groups of women, with the unicorn, an allusion to the emblems of the Farnesi and of Cardinal Tiberio Crispi. In the centre of the timber roof, decorated with lilies, appears the figure of the Archangel St. Michael.¹ Even in the objectionable Chamber of Cupid and Psyche, called the Bed-Chamber, the artistically carved and gilded ceiling, with its designs recalling the Pope and the same Cardinal Crispi, draws the eyes of the beholder to it. The painted frieze vies in beauty with the ceiling; on this Perino del Vaga has painted the tale of Cupid and Psyche as told by Apuleius. Some of these pictures are very free,² and

¹ A part of the frieze, the centrepiece of the roof, and some paintings in the Camera di Perseo are in the Cosmos Cath., 1902, 608-609, 614, 616, 618. Here (p. 613) are also the centrepiece of the Library roof and (p. 617) a portion of stucco relief from the frieze.

² See STEINMANN in the *Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst*, 1912, 86 *seq.*, who suspects that P. del Vaga's work contains the sketches destined by Raphael for the Farnesina. There is a good picture of the ceiling of the Psyche Saloon in the Cosmos Cath., 1912, 612. To the time of Paul III. also belong the oak presses in the round cupola-shaped room in the centre of the Papal suite of rooms in the Torre Borgia, used by that Pontiff as a "guardaroba" and treasure-chamber (see *Studi e Doc.*, XIV., 63 *seq.*). On the presses is the inscription: "Sedente Paulo III., P.M. pontif. sui a. XII." (*Cf.* also BERTOLOTTI, *Art. Lomb.*, I., 339.) On the pinnacle of the castle, under the angel, the arms of Paul III. are visible above those of Alexander VI. Some bits of the majolica pavement with the Farnese lilies are in the collection arranged by Borgatti, the admirable restorer of the Castle of St. Angelo. The marble statue of the Archangel Michael now set up in the Cortile dell' Angelo, taken by Borgatti for a work by Guglielmo della Porta, might, notwithstanding, well be identified with the Angel of Raffaello of Montelupo. (See our statements, Vol. X. of this work, p. 353.) The sword-hilt of the angel with the Farnese lilies, which Borgatti takes as an indication of the date, might belong to the restoration made necessary when the statue was struck by lightning. (See in Appendix

supplement in an astonishing way the unfinished composition of Raphael on the ceiling of the summer-house of the Farnesina; they breathe the very spirit of the pagan Renaissance, and are wholly unfitted for the apartments of a Pope. It is to be wished that Paul III. had not allowed the very mundane Cardinal Crispi, who since 1542 had been installed as castellan of St. Angelo,¹ so entirely free a hand.

The decoration of these two stately chambers, which rivalled the most beautiful in the Vatican itself,² was enhanced by the tapestries with which the walls were to be hung.³

The completion of the family palace of the Farnesi, which arose between the Campo de' Fiori and the Via Giulia, was permanently entrusted to Antonio da Sangallo. The mighty structure advanced without interruption, since after Paul III.'s elevation the necessary means flowed freely in. Pasquino's jest when he hung out a bush with the inscription, "Alms are requested for the building" (*Elemosina per la fabbrica*), struck Rome dumb. According to Vasari the plans underwent extension, and the appointments were also on a more splendid scale. This was specially the case with the noble ceiling, of which Sangallo himself made the sketch.⁴ Nothing was spared to make the building the

No. 23 in Vol. XI. for another instance of the kind, the *report of G. Peregrino of Dec. 14, 1537. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

¹ Cf. BENIGNI, *Miscell. d. Stor. Eccl.*, V. (1907), 257 *seq.*

² See J. F. Ferrettus in CONTELORIUS, XI., 48, f. 244 (*Secret Archives of the Vatican*).

³ Buonanni in his **letter of Nov. 12, 1548, mentions the arrival of magnificent tapestries from Florence, which were set up in the "Sala avanti il Concistorio" (*State Archives, Florence*).

⁴ Cf. VASARI, V., 469 *seq.*, 487; CLAUSSE, *Sangallo*, II., 67 *seq.*; LETAROUILLY, *Edif.*, 259 *seq.*; GEYMÜLLER, *Les du Cerceau*, Paris, 1887, 13, 26 *seqq.*; LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 151 *seq.*; BOURDON, *Un*

most magnificent among the many magnificent palaces of Rome.¹ The story long believed, that the Colosseum provided the quarry for the works, is a fable; later research has shown that the blocks of travertine were brought from Tivoli. Marble was procured from the ruins of Ostia, and in Rome, principally from the Baths of Caracalla and from the huge ruins in the Colonna gardens, supposed to be those of Aurelian's Temple of the Sun.²

The characteristic of grandeur which is peculiar to all genuine Roman work attaches to the Farnese palace in an overwhelming degree. The populace called it, from its shape, the "dice cube." In spite of the too close proximity of the narrow windows, the façade is one of the most imposing creations of the new architecture. The lily of the Farnesi has here the same decorative rôle assigned to it as that given to the rose in the ornaments of the Cancelleria. The magnitude of the façade is reproduced in the inner chambers, the massive spacious stairs, the vast halls and corridors. It is this ample and unequalled spaciousness, combined with the strength and harmony of the exterior, which makes the building the

plafond du palais Farnèse (Extr. d. Mél. d'archéol., XXVII.), Rome, 1907; THODE, V., 195. A comprehensive monograph on the Farnese Palace, two chapters of which have appeared in the Rev. d. Deux Mondes, 1895 and 1900, is being prepared by F. de Navenne, once councillor of the French embassy to the Holy See. (Cf. also NAVENNE, P. L. Farnèse, 267 seq.)

¹ Cf. AMASÆUS, 19, 78. According to the account books of the Apostolic Chamber, the sums expended on the building in the years 1546-1549 alone amounted to 73,178 scudi (FEA, Dissert. s. rovine di Roma, 399; MORONI, XXIII., 202). By 1542 Paul III. had already come to have a quarrel with Pier Luigi, who was unwilling to contribute 400 scudi monthly to the building. (See in Appendix No. 38 in Vol. XI. N. Serristori's *report of Aug. 30, 1542. State Archives, Florence.)

² See LANCIANI, Scavi, II., 119, 153 seq., and Renaissance, 123 seq.

type of a Roman palace,¹ and the worthy depository of the treasures of antiquity collected by this Roman house.

By the beginning of 1546 the exterior façade had been pushed as far as the cornice. How much depended on the correct formation of this feature for the general effect of the whole edifice did not escape the attention of Paul III. He invited a competition in which Perino del Vaga, Sebastiano del Piombo, and Vasari took part, but the Pope's choice fell on the designs of Michael Angelo.

With what caution the latter proceeded to work is shown by the circumstance that he had a wooden model of the cornice, more than three metres high, affixed to a corner of the palace. The effect produced gave the Pope the highest satisfaction. Vasari is of opinion that neither ancient nor modern architecture can show anything more beautiful and rich. The work has justly received the highest praise, and has been called "the cornice of all cornices."²

On the death of Sangallo on the 29th of September 1546 Michael Angelo became sole director of the building works. In addition to the cornice, to him is certainly due the Loggia over the chief doorway, the escutcheon of the Pope there introduced, and the uppermost story,

¹ Cf. TAINE, *Italie*, I. (1889), 255 *seq.*; *Gaz. des Beaux Arts*, XXXI. (1904), 127 *seq.*; see BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, 201, 207, 217; NOHL, *Tagebuch*, Stuttgart, 1877, 150; EBE, I., 134; SCHMARSOW, *Beiträge zur Ästhetik*, II., Leipzig, 1897, 80 *seq.*; RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 73; GNOLI, *Roma*, Roma, 1909, 166 *seq.*

² See VASARI, V., 470 *seq.*; VII., 223; SPRINGER, 470; WEY, *Rome*, 362; BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, 84, 103; GEYMÜLLER, *Michelangelo als Architekt*, 42; THODE, I., 445; V., 195 *seqq.*; WILLICH, 82 *seq.*, and also MAKOWSKY, 327, 389; *Jahrbuch der preuss. Kunstsammlungen*, XXX., 1 *seqq.*; RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 73.

with its course of pilasters, of the truly regal courtyard. The two lower stories were the work of Sangallo. Michael Angelo, whose interference with the projected scheme of Sangallo was not always happy, had yet another bold plan in view. Through Sangallo's beautiful entrance-hall, with its richly coffered vaulted ceiling and its twelve antique Doric granite pillars, and through the nobly arcaded court, a view was to be obtained in a hall in the background of the striking Dirce group, the so-called Farnese bull, forming the adornment of a fountain; beyond this a bridge over the Tiber was here to connect the Farnese "Vigna" with the main building of the palace.¹ Unfortunately, this junction of the two banks of the river was not carried out. Only the great antique group was successfully placed in the court of which it remained the ornament until its removal in 1786 to Naples.

The Farnese palace, the Vatican, and St. Angelo were not sufficient for a Pope who loved frequently to change his Roman residence. During the hot months it had been his custom since 1535 to seek regularly the palace of S. Marco on account of the healthier air. From this time forward this palace again came into use as a Papal summer residence.² Although the Church of S. Maria in Aracœli was not at a very great distance, in order to hear Mass there more easily he had, in April 1535, a wooden bridge constructed from the so-called Palazetto

¹ See VASARI, VII., 223 *seq.*; *cf.* WEY, *loc. cit.*; BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, 56, 203, 204, 339; GEYMÜLLER, 37, 41; MAKOWSKY, 327 *seq.*; THODE, V., 200 *seq.* For the Vigna which Cardinal Farnese bought at the Porta Settimiana, see LANCIANI, Scavi, II., 177; *ibid.* on a villa at S. Onofrio, bought in 1547 by Orazio Farnese.

² See DENGEL, Der Palazzo di Venezia, 95 *seq.*

to the church above mentioned, which afterwards was replaced by one of stone and formed a counterpart to the corridor which unites the Palazzo Vecchio with the Palazzo Pitti.¹ His frequent visits to the Franciscan convent adjoining S. Maria in Aracœli ripened in Paul III. the intention of building a palace on that airy height, from which one of the widest and fairest views of Rome lay open. As a site he chose the garden of the Franciscans facing the Corso.² A brief of February 1546 ordained that this palace, erected at great expense and adorned with paintings and stucco-work, should pass neither to the Minorites of Aracœli nor to the holder of the cardinal's title of S. Marco, but be a permanent possession of the Popes.³ Those of an older generation can remember the picturesque grounds and the stern tower of Paul III., with its wide survey. To the grief of all friends of art, it fell a victim in 1886 to the great memorial to Victor Emmanuel, which now conceals the Holy of Holies of the Capitol.⁴

¹ Together with the documents published by Lanciani (II., 55 *seq.*), *cf.* the *report of F. Peregrino, dat. Rome, Mar. 3, 1535, where it says: "et già si da principio a far l' corridor che andarà dal detto palazzo di S. Marcho al Capitolio" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The hitherto unknown account of a wooden bridge I found in the following post-script to a *report of Sanchez to Ferdinand I., dated Rome, Apr. 22, 1535: "Papa deliberavit servande suae prospere valetudinis causa habitare a die S. Marci palatium sancti Marci nuncupatum per totam aestatem fecitque fieri pontem ligneum a dicto palatio ad monasterium usque Aracoeli, quo ipse ad officium divinum ad dictum coenobium secreta ire possit" (Court and State Archives, Vienna).

² See CASIMIRO, S. Maria in Aracœli, 468; *cf.* also J. F. Ferrettus in CONTELORIUS, XI., 48, f. 243 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ See CASIMIRO, 468 *seq.* For the decoration see BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 178.

⁴ Picture in SCHÖNER, Rome, 268; Cosmos Cath., 1899, 119; DENGEL, Der Palazzo di Venezia, 16, 17, 19; see also VETTER, L' Ara

In certain respects also the beginnings of the Papal palace on the Quirinal are linked with the name of Paul III.¹ In the last years of his life he found pleasure in visiting this salubrious hill, the approach to which was made still better² in June 1549.

Among the most famous³ restorations of Roman churches undertaken⁴ during the reign of Paul III., and approved

Cœli, Rome, 1886, 66 *seq.*, where there is also a picture (*cf.* also CALVI, in the N. Antologia, 1908, No. 886). The tower was much injured by lightning in 1548 and had to be rebuilt in parts (see LANCIANI, II., 57). This same misfortune formed a theme for the court poets (see Carm. ill. poet. Ital., VI., Flor., 1709, 343). There is an *epigram of H. Borgia on the "Domus Capitolina" of Paul III., in Cod. Barb. lat., 1903, f. 12^b of the Vatican Library.

¹ *Cf.* BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 200. The scheme of buying up Cardinal Carafa's villa on the Quirinal is mentioned in a *letter from Serristori of Feb. 27, 1545 (State Archives, Florence).

² *June 13, 1549: "Jacobus Meleghino sc. 100 in instaurationem Celsi montis Caballi ad commodum S. Bⁿis aptam exponenda." Mand. 1548-1549, f. 127 (State Archives, Rome).

³ *Cf.* AMASAEUS, 74 *seq.*

⁴ Thus on the Baptistery and the Lateran Basilica (*cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 557; RASPONUS, Basil. Lat., 132 *seq.*; ROHAULT, Latran, planche 35; Atti Mod., IV., 128), on the campanile of S. Maria Maggiore (*Mand., 1543-1545, f. 140. State Archives, Rome), at S. Pietro in Carcere (ARMELLINI, 2nd ed., 539), at S. Maria plantarum (Domine quo vadis; see CIACONIUS, III., 556), at the Pantheon (FORCELLA, I., 295; VISCONTI, Congreg. d. Virtuosi al Pantheon, Roma, 1869, 16), at S. Marcello (*Mand., 1537-1541, f. 160^b), S. Anastasia (*Mand., 1539, f. 92) and at the campanile of S. Maria de Gradulis (=S. Aniano?) (*Mand. 1540-1541, f. 205^b-206. State Archives, Rome). In 1545 the roof of the Sistine Chapel was restored; *Mand., Jan. 3, 1545: "A m^{ro} Quirico et m^{ro} Francesco compagni muratori sc. 50 a bon conto di reffare il tetto della capella di papa Sisto in palazzo che si abruciò la notte di S. Silvestro" (*Edif. publ., 1544-1549, f. VI.; *ibid.*, f. VII., further payments for the same object. State Archives, Rome). For the church of the confraternity of Papal servants, S. Marta near S. Peter's, see ARMELLINI, 761.

by his contemporaries, was especially that of S. Maria in Sassia, which then was named after the adjoining Hospital of S. Spirito in Sassia. From plans of Sangallo an entirely new church was erected, a creation of the later Renaissance full of simplicity and dignity.¹ The works also which Cardinal Federigo Cesi had undertaken since 1544 on the Church of Our Lady, not far from the Palazzo Mattei, led to a reconstruction of the former edifice, near which St. Ignatius had set up a home for poor and unprotected girls. The church received the name of S. Caterina de' Funari² from the ropemakers who worked in that neighbourhood in the ruins of the Flaminian Circus. The rebuilding of the national church of the French, S. Luigi, was still far from complete.³ No new feature was added by these churches to the aspect of the city.

The buildings erected under Paul III. in the States of the Church, on all of which, almost without exception, Sangallo was actively employed, consisted principally of defensive constructions, the necessity of which, from the point of view of a Turkish invasion, could not escape the Pope's strong practical sense.⁴ For the most part the works were in the nature of restorations or the furtherance of projects already begun. In this respect very comprehensive operations were carried out in the two chief sea-

¹ VASARI, IV., 604, n. 3; Arch. Stor. d. Arte, VII. (1893), 124; ARMELLINI, 773; CLAUSSE, Sangallo, II., 356 *seq.*; Repertorium für Kunstwissensch., 1884, 443 *seq.*; EBE, I., 24; WILLICH, 139 *seq.*

² ARMELLINI, 567; FORCELLA, IV., 331-334; LANCIANI, Scavi, II., 64 *seq.* For the façade, not finished until later, and the archetype of the later baroque façades of Rome, see WILLICH, 134 *seq.*

³ FABRICIUS, 240.

⁴ AMASAEUS, 66.

ports, Ancona¹ and Civita Vecchia,² extending over several years. Together with these, restorations were set on foot on the castles and fortifications of Tivoli,³ Civita Castellana,⁴ Montefiascone, Ostia,⁵ Assisi,⁶ Anagni,⁷ Tolentino,⁸

¹ Cf. besides the *accounts in the Roman State Archives, the *brief to Baldovinetto, episc. Anconit., dat. Nov. 25, 1534, who had been appointed by Clement VII. on March 16, 1534, "supremus curator operis et fabricae fortilitii nostrae civit. Anconit. per eum (Clement VII.) a fundamentis incohate." This was confirmed by Paul III., with the injunction that the inhabitants of the town and county should assist him (Min. brev. Arm., 40, t. 49, n. 44). The works consumed great sums (see Nuntiaturberichte, IV., 158); by a *brief of Oct. 29, 1539, to "Petrus Ventura Zephirus, commiss. general super munit. Anconae," Paul III. insisted on their completion (Arm. 41, t. 15, n. 1105). As Sangallo in 1541 was given the task of building the citadel of Perugia, his place was taken in Ancona by Gianbattista Pelori (see Atti Mod., IV., 250); Gianuigi (in the Rassneg. bibliogr. d. arte Ital. [1907]) had already been deputed for this work in December 1539 (*Mand., 1539 to 1541, f. 45, 57^b. State Archives, Rome). From a *brief to the "praesidens Romandiolae ep. Casali" of March 13, 1542, it is evident that Cardinal Carpi had at the Pope's instance raised 15,000 scudi to be expended on fortifying Ancona against Turkish attack. At the same time orders were issued to levy a like subsidy on the Jews of the province for the protection of sea towns of the Romagna (Arm. 41, t. 25, n. 673. Secret Archives of the Vatican). CIACONIUS, III., 555.

² Cf. GUGLIELMOTTI, Fortificazione, 225 *seq.*, where there are also fuller details on the share taken by Michelangelo. The rich material in the *account books of the Roman State Archives has only been partly utilised by Guglielmotti.

³ See *Mand., 1548 to 1549 and 1549 to 1550 (State Archives, Rome).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1535 to 1537; 1539 to 1542; 1540 to 1543.

⁵ Cf. GUGLIELMOTTI, 56, 87; see also *Mand., 1535 to 1537; 1540 to 1543; 1548 to 1549; 1549 to 1550 (State Archives, Rome).

⁶ Cf. A. BRISI, Della rocca di Assisi, 1898.

⁷ *Mand., 1545 to 1546 (State Archives, Rome).

⁸ *Ibid.*, 1548 to 1549.

Camerino,¹ Fano,² Ascoli,³ Loreto,⁴ Rimini,⁵ Ravenna,⁶ Parma,⁷ and Piacenza.⁸

An entirely new work was the fortress of Perugia, erected after the insurrection. This was begun as early as September 1540,⁹ but the progress was so slow that the impatient Pope appointed a new commissary-general on January the 14th, 1542.¹⁰ It was not until 1543 that the Rocca Paolina, as the mighty stronghold was called, was finished in its essential features.¹¹ The situation of Perugia at the point of junction of two ranges of hills offered great difficulties in the construction of a fortress; but they were

¹ *Mand., extraord., 1546 to 1548 (State Archives, Rome).

² See Atti Mod., IV., 253 *seq.*

³ *Mand., 1535 to 1537 (State Archives, Rome).

⁴ See TURSELLINIS, Hist. Lauret., 3; *cf.* also BELLUZZI, 130, 180; Stimmen aus Maria Laach, XL., 168, on the works on the Santa Casa.

⁵ *Mand., 1535 to 1537 (State Archives, Rome).

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ See Atti Mod., III., 474 *seq.*; *cf.* *Mand., 1548 to 1549; 1549 to 1550.

⁸ See Atti Mod., II., 481; *cf.* Tes. seg., 1543 to 1545.

⁹ Pier Luigi visited Perugia at that time on account of the building (see Antella's *report, dat. Rome, Sept. 24, 1540. State Archives, Florence).

¹⁰ See the *brief nominating Barthol. Massolus to be commissary-general "arcis Perusie," whereby the work was completed. (Arm., 41, t. 23, n. 53. Secret Archives of the Vatican); *cf.* also Vol. XI. of this work, p. 334 *seq.*

¹¹ For what follows see article, with many illustrations, by G. BACILE DI CASTIGLIONE, in *L'Arte*, VI. (1903), 347 *seqq.*; see also Atti Mod., II., 447 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, Sangallo, II., 375 *seq.*; the periodical *Augusta Perusia*, I. (1906). The inscription without the phrase often introduced "ad coercendam Perusinatorum audaciam" in CIACONIUS, III., 555. The only coat-of-arms in preservation is on the Porta Marzia, with the inscription P. P. III. For the work of embellishment undertaken under Cardinal Crispi, who was Legate of Perugia from 1545, *cf.* ROCCHI, *Piante*, 290, and the *Miscell.* of BENIGNI, cited *supra*, p. 579, n. 1.

overcome by the genius of Sangallo, who produced a remarkable specimen of engineering. The whole consisted of two parts. Above was the so-called citadel, commanding a large portion of the city; somewhat lower down came a second fort, named Tanaglia, connected with the former by a long and steep approach. The citadel, which must have taken up almost the whole suburb of S. Giuliana, occupied the ground on which the prefecture now stands, with a portion of the Piazza Vittorio Emmanuele, part of the hotel Brufani, of the bank of Italy and of the Palazzo Calderini. Above the entrance was a statue of Paul III. in terra-cotta, with his name and coat-of-arms. In planning the fortifications, Sangallo had spared not merely the ancient Porta Marzia, but also the palace of the Baglioni; these were still visible in 1860, but in the same year were, together with the fortress and its system of works, razed to the ground. The statue of Paul III. also was barbarously destroyed, and, with the exception of one, all the fine coats-of-arms and interesting inscriptions.

Orvieto, a town greatly loved by the Pope and to him a second home, was in many ways embellished.¹ He gave orders for the restoration and rebuilding² of the Papal Palace begun by Boniface VIII. and named Palazzo Soliano. The famous fountain of Clement VII., the well of S. Patrizio, was completed by Simone Mosca.³ In com-

¹ Cf. FUMI, *La Prima entrata del P. Paolo III. in Orvieto*, Orvieto, 1892, 6; see also MANENTE, 259, 277.

² See FUMI (*loc. cit.*, 6); here also for the works in the Cathedral. For the support of the "fabbrica del palazzone," cf. Lorenzo Monaldeschi's *letter to the "Conservatori della pace" at Orvieto, dat. Rome, Jan. 3, 1543 (Communal Archives, Orvieto).

³ Round the well runs a frieze with the Farnese lilies and the inscription twice repeated: *Quod natura || monumento || inviderat || indu || stria adiecit* (cf. VASARI, VI., 303; PICCOLOMINI-ADAMI, Orvieto, 234; *Atti Mod.*, II., 473 *seq.*).

memoration of this work, which was to supplement the scanty water-supply of the town, Clement VII. had commissioned Benvenuto Cellini to strike a medal showing Moses with his uplifted staff, and the thirsty multitude lying at his feet. Paul III. caused the design of this medal¹ to be appropriated for another bearing his own image.

At Viterbo, which he first visited in 1536 and often afterwards, his generosity was amply displayed. On his first visit he at once took over the cost of finishing the fine roof with which Sangallo was decorating the much-frequented pilgrims' shrine of the Benedictine abbey of the Madonna della Quercia. He also ordered a new road to be made to this sanctuary, for which he had a great veneration, and supplied it with a fountain.² He also restored the palace of the Governors and the castle.³

To the little town of Frascati in the Alban Hills he devoted much attention. This delightful spot, famed for its pure air and enchanting views, had become part of the States of the Church in May 1537,⁴ and during his frequent

¹ A specimen is in the Cabinet of Coins in Munich.

² See *Cronache di Viterbo*, ed. CIAMPI, 436; CLAUSSE, Sangallo, II., 143 *seq.*; PINZI, *Mem. e doc. s. S. Maria d. Quercia*, Rome, 1880, 125, 138; MORTIER-FERRETTI, *S. Maria d. Quercia*, Firenze, 1904, 40 *seq.*, 89 *seq.*, 131 *seq.*

³ Cf. CIACONIUS, 557; see NOAVES, VII., 57; for the castle see *Mand., 1535-1537; 1540-1543 (State Archives, Rome).

⁴ Lucrezia della Rovere had sold Frascati to Pier Luigi Farnese on Aug. 30, 1536 (see SEGHETTI, *Frascati* [1906], 154). Shortly afterwards disturbances broke out in Frascati, whereupon Jo. Gasp. Argulus was ordered there as commissary (see the *brief to him of Oct. 30, 1536, in *Arm.*, 41, t. 4, n. 51 of the Secret Archives of the Vatican). On May 7, 1537, Pier Luigi Farnese gave Frascati to the Apostolic Chamber, receiving Castro in exchange (see SEGHETTI, *loc. cit.*).

visits to the Villa Rufina—afterwards widely celebrated as the Villa Falconieri—had captivated the Pope's fancy.¹ In 1538 he revived the ancient bishopric of Tusculum² and transferred its seat to Frascati, thus raised to the rank of a city. A wall of defence was flung round the spot and the interior so beautified that the town might have been said to have been rebuilt. Situated amid vineyards and olive trees, it became henceforth a chosen holiday place for Roman society.³ A medal perpetuated the restoration of the spot so near the ancient Tusculum, and the residence of the Pope within its walls.⁴

Buildings and other works of general utility were forwarded in many other cities of the Papal States by the support of Paul III.: in Otricoli,⁵ Spoleto,⁶ Foligno,⁷

¹ For the Villa Falconieri, since 1907 the property of the German Emperor, see LANCIANI, Scavi, III., 45; CANCELLIERI, *Sopra il tarantismo*, Roma, 1817, 157; SEGHETTI, 308.

² SEGHETTI, 154.

³ There is a list of the houses pulled down in order to give regularity to Frascati, with the sums paid in compensation, in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XVI., 517; *cf.* LANCIANI, Scavi, III., 44; see also Atti Mod., IV., 128, and specially SEGHETTI, 154 *seq.*

⁴ VENUTI, Numism., XXIX., 83; BARBIER, III., 419.

⁵ See the *brief to Otricoli, dat. Feb. 4, 1547, giving permission to rebuild the walls and to drain a marsh on the proceeds of increased taxation (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 38, n. 63, Secret Archives of the Vatican); *ibid.*, in the index of briefs, a document is given under the date of December 1548, by which the Vice-Legate of Perugia is enjoined to inform himself concerning the works of the architect Petr. Franc. Clementis and of the commissary Franc. Castagna in the draining of the marshes of Foligno, Trevi, and Montefalcone, and to see to their payments.

⁶ See the *brief to Spoleto, dat. March 4, 1543, on the restoration of the aqueduct (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 26, n. 159, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁷ See the *brief to Foligno, dat. Perugia, Sept. 19, 1535: gift of 200 scudi for the repair of the palace (Arm., 40, t. 52, n. 377, Secret

Spello,¹ Perugia,² Loreto,³ Cesena,⁴ Macerata⁵ and Ascoli.⁶ At the Villa Magliana, where the Pope often stayed, restorations were begun from the year 1535.⁷ The Pope's latter years were signalized by a work of exceptional utility, which he also had commemorated by a medal; this was a canal, the "Cava Paolina," for regulating the overflow of the Velino and putting a stop to inundations in the valleys of Rieti and Terni.⁸ Unfortunately, Sangallo,

Archives of the Vatican). See also the inscription from S. Feliciano in CIACONIUS, III., 555, and FALOCI-PULIGNANI, XVII., Centenario di S. Feliciano, 242.

¹ See the inscription on the Palazzo Comunale.

² See the *brief to Joh. Sbotta of March 16, 1537, concerning the restoration of the Legate's palace (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 5, n. 98, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ CIACONIUS, III., 556 *seq.*

⁴ See the *brief to Cesena dat. Sept. 18, 1536: present of 1000 ducats for three years for the enlargement and adornment of the town (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 3, n. 144, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ *Reparatio pal. Macerat.*, *Mand., June 9, 1539 (State Archives, Rome).

⁶ *Reparatio pal. Asculi.*, *Mand., 1545-1546.

⁷ See *Mand., 1535-1537.

⁸ See GAYE, II., 344; VASARI, V., 469; *Atti Mod.*, II., 482 *seq.*; the letter of Sangallo published in *L' Umbria*, 1900; CLAUSSE, II., 401 *seq.* The *commission to "Petrus Angelinus episc. Nep. et Ant. de S. Gallo arch. nost.," dat. Rome, March 2, 1545, "de exsiccanda palude Reatina" in *Cod. Vat.*, 3933, f. 21, of the Vatican Library. Here also belongs the *brief to Bernardino Callini, Bishop of Segni, of June 11, 1545; to him was given the post of commissioner "ad, dirigendos cursus aquarum etiam per possessiones particularium" (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 35, n. 355). To the governor of Rieti was issued the command, dat. Terni, Sept. 7, 1546: since Reati, "in effusione lacus Velini" and "pro exiccandis paludibus agri Reatini," had undergone great expense and derived great benefit from the draining, all persons advantaged, including the clergy, were to be compelled to contribute aid in money (Arm., 41, t. 37,

while laying out the works, contracted a deadly fever, which cut him off in the midst of his labours at Terni on the 29th of September 1546.¹ In other parts of the Papal States also Paul III. directed his attention to the drainage of the marshes.²

The Pope also co-operated with and supported his family in extensive building operations, especially in the domain where the possessions of the house originally lay. Pier Luigi Farnese restored and enlarged the castle at Nepi³ built by Alexander VI., had a castle built by Peruzzi at Caprarola,⁴ and at a distance of six kilometres from Castel Farnese founded in the valley of Olpeta

n. 606, Secret Archives of the Vatican). For a plan produced by Fr. Oliva to prevent the inundation of the Tiber, see GORI, Archivio, VI., 178.

¹ The certificate produced by CLAUSSE (II., 409) which places the death on Sunday, Aug. 3, 1546, cannot be correct, for this reason, that in that year the 3rd was not a Sunday. The 3rd October, which is often given, and to which THODE (I., 445) still adheres, is also incorrect. The right date is given in the *Ephem., very accurate in matters of chronology: "1546, 29 Septemb., obiit Antonius Sangallus inter architectos sui temporis facile princeps" (Cod. Vat., 6978, f. 154, of the Vatican Library). For Sangallo's family see Nuovi Documenti, ed. BERTOLLOTTI, Roma, 1892.

² See the *briefs to Trevi, dat. May 2, 1535 (Min. brev. Arm., 40, t. 51, n. 233), to Cardinal Cupis, dat. July 12, 1535 (*ibid.*, t. 52, n. 251), to Cardinal Grimani, Legate of Perugia, dat. Sept. 24, 1536 (*ibid.*, Arm., 41, t. 3, n. 197, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. VASARI, V., 465; the description of GREGOROVIVS (Lucretia Borgia, 140-141); Atti Mod., II., 476 *seq.* An inscription on the castle says: "P. Aloisius Farnesius Dux I. Castri et Nepete monimentum hoc ad tutelam civitatis extruxit 1540." Expenditure on these works in the *Mand., 1545-1546; 1546-1548; 1548-1551. The church of S. Tolomeo (cf. WILLICH, 46) Paul III. helped by an Indulgence (see Bulla indulgent., dat. 1542 vii. Id. Ian. A° 9°. An impression by Bladus is in the Bibliotheca Vittorio Emanuele).

⁴ Cf. WILLICH, 93 *seq.*

the new town of Castro, with defences by Sangallo. This architect also at Pier Luigi's orders drew up plans for the ducal palace erected in Castro, for the church and convent of the Franciscans, for the mint and the arcades of the principal square. Thus, as Annibalo Caro remarked, out of a den of gipsies rose a new Carthage. The comparison was destined to be fulfilled to the letter: for a hundred years later Castro, having risen in rebellion against Innocent X., was utterly destroyed.¹

A series of constructions in the Duchy of Castro were about 1546 entrusted to Vignola, afterwards so famous. At the beginning of Paul III.'s reign Vignola had been employed at the Vatican,² when he also carried out pictorial decorations.³ From 1541 to 1543 he resided in France; after that he was a candidate for the difficult task of executing the façade of S. Petronio in Bologna, a work followed with deep interest by Paul III.⁴ In spite of Cardinal Farnese's⁵ warm recommendations Vignola's sketches were rejected; he then found in the Farnese family more enlightened patrons of the architect's art.⁶

¹ Cf. Lett. famigl. di Caro., ed. COMIN, I., 184; VASARI, V., 463; CLAUSSE, Sangallo, II., 306 *seq.*; NAVENNE, 275.

² See WILlich, 16 *seq.*

³ *Nov. 22, 1538; Payment to Vignola for painting "scabelli in thalamo S. S^{ti}s" (Mand., 1537-1541, f. 142^b; cf. *ibid.*, f. 155^b, Dec. 24); *ibid.*, 1539-1542, f. 6 and 85: "Petro de Senis et Jacopo de Vignola pictoribus" for "pict. fact. in sex appendiciis tubarum ad usum milit. equit. levis armat. S. S^{ti}s" (State Archives, Rome).

⁴ See WILlich, 20 *seq.*, 23 *seq.* For Paul III. interest cf. BELLUZZI, 120 *seq.*, 178. *The brief of confirmation of Vignola on the commission of architects for S. Petronio is dated March 7, 1541; Arm., 41, t. 20, n. 200 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁵ See in Appendix No. 30 Cardinal Farnese's *letter of Aug. 23, 1545 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁶ See WILlich, 30 *seq.*, 40 *seq.*

III.

The highly prized tranquillity and prosperity which Rome enjoyed under the rule of Paul III.,¹ the keen interest of the Pope, his family, and the rich cardinals in all branches of art, could not fail to exercise a stimulating influence of the most useful kind.² Very often, however, the quality of artistic creativeness is not commensurate with its quantity. This is specially the case with sculpture, which held an even more subordinate place than it had done under Clement VII. With the exception of the Lombard, Guglielmo della Porta, who was repeatedly employed, especially as a restorer of antiques, by Paul III.,³ almost all the others engaged in the Papal service were Tuscan sculptors. Among them are found Lorenzetto, Bandinelli, Ammanati, Raffaello da Montelupo, Perino da Vinci, Giovanni Antonio Dosio, Nanni di Baccio Bigio, Simone Mosca, Montorsoli, and Zacchia.⁴

Michael Angelo was the authoritative name in sculpture

¹ Cf. the inscription, now vanished: "Paulo III. P.M. auree securitatis auctori Prosper Mochus muniendae urbis curator posuit 1546": FORCELLA, XIII., 173; see also AMASAEUS, 56 *seq.*, 62 *seq.*, and the *poem by Martius Alterius in Cod. Vat., 3691, Vatican Library.

² For the advancement of art by the Farnese family and the cardinals see MÜNTZ, Hist., III., 236 *seq.*, 260 *seq.*

³ See VASARI, VII., 225; Mél. d'archéol., IX., 54 *seq.* Payments to G. della Porta in BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 188, 190, 207, 211, and Art. Lomb., I., 132; LANCIANI, Scavi, III., 265.

⁴ See MÜNTZ, *loc. cit.*, III., 235; REUMONT, III., 2nd ed., 723 *seq.* The marble statue of Paul III. in the palazzo pubblico at Bologna is by Zacchia. The promising Belgian sculptor Paul Albus died prematurely in 1538; his tombstone in S. Croce in Gerusalemme, which FORCELLA (VIII., 192 *seq.*), in 1876, could not get a sight of, is now re-erected in that church on the left entrance. For Pietro Stella, who died in 1543, see BERTOLOTTI, Artisti Veneti, 24.

even among his personal enemies. This great master, upheld by the Papal favour, was a constant source of wonderment to his contemporaries on account of his works and of the individuality of his character. On the 10th of December 1537 he received the rights of Roman citizenship, the highest honour which the Eternal City could bestow.¹ His fellow-artists, who were entirely under the spell of his original and sovereign style, looked up to him as a patriarch and paid homage to every judgment that he expressed. There is clear evidence of this in the description of the antique statues of Rome written in 1550 by Ulysses Aldrovandi. Notwithstanding the brevity of his narration, he never omits to note the praise lavished by Michael Angelo on those pieces by which the latter had been specially attracted, as, for example, the Torso of Hercules or the Amazon in the collection of Cardinal Cesi.² Even the monument of Julius II., so great and powerful in its first design, so poor in its final achievement, could not impair his firmly grounded reputation. The statue of Moses by itself compensated for all other deficiencies, and raised the mausoleum of the Rovere to a solitary pre-eminence over the long series of Papal tombs.³ It might seem almost an act of historic justice that the statue of Moses should have been reserved for the burial-place of Julius II., while Leo X., who was so extravagantly belauded in his lifetime, should have, like his cousin Clement VII., to rest satisfied with a monument displaying the marks of a sculpture already on the wane. On the other hand, the representations of Paul III. belong to the best works of

¹ See GREGOROVIVS, *Kleine Schriften*, I., 249 *seq.* For Michael Angelo's exemption from the jurisdiction of the guild of the Scarpellini and Marmorarii see POGATSCHER in Steinmann, II., 753 *seq.*

² See SPRENGER, 459.

³ HARNACK, *Rom*, II. : *Neuere Kunst*, 104.

this period: his fine marble statue in the Capitol and his magnificent bust now preserved in the Naples Museum.¹

If the domain of sculpture left much to be desired, there was rich compensation in the full blossoming of minor arts and handicrafts. Medallists, jewellers, gold and silversmiths, as well as artistic cabinet makers, produced works of high perfection; the period was also one in which the manufacture of textile fabrics and of pottery flourished. The account books of Paul III. abound in payments made for a long succession of works of art of the above kind.² Special mention is made of a new and magnificent tiara.³ The Pope would have ordered yet more if his coffers had not so often been drained by Turkish war expenses and other imperative claims.⁴ The wealth of Papal property in work of this kind is clearly set forth in the inventories drawn up during the reign of Paul III.⁵

¹ Cf. Vol. XI. of this work, p. 31.

² Extracts concerning goldsmiths and jewellers are given in GORI, *Archivio*, I., 82 *seq.*, 85 *seq.*, 90, 95 *seq.*, 99 *seq.*, 110 *seq.*; BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 171 *seq.*, 177, 179, 182-187, 191-196, 198, 199, 201-204, *Artisti Veneti*, 30 *seq.*, *Art. Bologn.*, 98 *seq.*, and *Artisti Subalp.*, 117. For the goldsmith Pellegrino di Leuti see *Atti Mod.*, VI., 341 *seq.*; FONTANA, II., 463. Magnificent work is to be seen on the window shutters in the Sala di Costantino in the Vatican. They are adorned with the arms and emblems of Paul III. For tapestries of this Pope, see *Chronique des Arts*, 1876, 262; MÜNTZ, *Tapiss.*, 35, 38, and *Tapiss. de Raphaël*, 2; *Jahrbuch der preuss. Kunstsammlungen*, XXIII., 106 *seq.*; cf. also *supra*, p. 579, n. 3.

³ AMASAEUS, 74; cf. MÜNTZ, *La Tiare*, 78 *seq.*, 89 *seq.*

⁴ This reason was adduced by the Pope in a *brief to the Duke William of Bavaria of July 18, 1540, in which he declares that he is unable to buy a valuable cross (*Min. brev. Arm.*, 41, t. 18, n. 615, *Secret Archives of the Vatican*).

⁵ Cf. *Inventarium sachrarii S. D. N. of Nov. 15, 1547* (*Invent.*, I. [3] in *State Archives, Rome*), published by Bertolotti: *Inventaire de la chapelle Papale sous Paul III. en 1547*, annot. per X. BARBIER DE

Unfortunately, only a very few relics of this period are now preserved in Rome. At the time of the French Revolution many objects of the highest interest and value were seized as plunder.¹ This was the heavy price which had to be paid for the absence in Rome of a dynasty such as existed in Florence, the hereditary owners of costly works of art. To-day the swords of honour belonging to the days of Paul III. must be sought for in Cracow and Madrid.² The Cluny Museum in Paris contains a precious collection of faience.³ Among the treasures of the Naples museum is the Cassetina Farnese in silver-gilt made for

MONTAULT, Tours, 1878, and again in *Œuvres*, I., 273 *seq.*—both unfortunately are insufficient. Professor Pogatscher having compared the publication with the original MS., states: The inventory is not printed in full; the selection, both as regards what is given and what is withheld, has been made in an arbitrary manner. Extracts printed word for word are not distinguished from those which are merely summarized; two parts of the Inventory (from f. 8, 8^b and 15, 15^b) are printed twice over in a summary, out of sheer carelessness—the first in Nos. 220–232 and 241–261, the second in Nos. 345–352 and 353–366; this, too, is done in such a way that many pieces of the Inventory appear twice in print (*e.g.* 220 = 241, 221 = 242, 232 = 261, 352 = 366, and so forth); that the duplicate copies are not identical throughout is owing to the way in which the excerpts were made: in each case only one selection was hit upon, and the choice did not fall on the exactly identical piece.

¹ Thus the silver statues of the Apostles made for St. Peter's in 1545 (see *Arch. d. Arte*, VI. [1893], 239 *seq.*; *cf.* BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 196–197, 199–200, 202–203).

² The consecrated sword sent by Paul III. in 1539 to the Polish King Sigismund Augustus was preserved in the cathedral treasury at Cracow (*cf.* *Monum. du moyen-âge et de la Renaissance dans l'ancienne Pologne*, p. p. A. PRZEZDZIECKI et E. ROSTAWIECKI, II^e Série, Varsovie et Paris, 1855 *seq.*). The sword of honour of Charles V. is in the armoury at Madrid (see *Gaz. d. Beaux Arts*, 1895, II., 483).

³ Cluny, n. 2902–2903; water-jug with the Farnese arms.

Cardinal Alessandro by Giovanni Bernardi da Castel Bolognese. This casket is surmounted by an admirable statue of Hercules; at the four corners are Minerva, Mars, Venus and Bacchus; while the panels of rock-crystal divided by caryatides are cut into representations of ancient myths and stories.¹ The magnificent candlesticks and crucifix for long attributed to Cellini, and presented by Cardinal Farnese to the treasury of S. Peter's, were made in 1582 by Antonino Gentile da Faenza.²

More fortunately, the coins and medals of Paul III., who endeavoured to regulate the coinage of his states with great exactitude,³ have been almost completely preserved. Among them are some fine pieces; all reproduce admirably the characteristic features of the Pope. The representations on the obverse, and the surrounding inscriptions, present to the beholder the entire history of his papacy.⁴ The Papal mint then employed artificers of the first rank. Benvenuto Cellini made for Paul III. a gold piece with the Farnese arms on one side, and a stately, richly draped figure of St. Paul on the other. Other names worthy of mention here are Giacomo Balducci, Lodovico de Capitaneis,

¹ See MÜNTZ, *Hist.*, III., 239, 712; PLON, *Cellini*, 296 *seqq.*; THODE, V., 247 *seq.*

² See PLON, 280 *seq.*; THODE, V., 252 *seq.*

³ See GARAMPI, *Monet. Pontif.*, 37 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*, 156, 159 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 254 *seq.*, "dichiarazione sul valore del ducato di camera, 1535," and pp. 249 *seq.*, 256-289, the "capitoli" of the Zecca at Rome and other mints in the Papal States. The number of coins minted under Paul III. amounted, according to Cinagli, to 156, there is a very complete series of these in the Vatican collection. Cf. VALLENTIN, *Les écus d'or avignonois du Pape Paul III. : Annuaire de la Soc. Franç. de numismat.*, XIV. (1890); VITALINI, *Scudo d'oro ined. di Paolo III. per Camerino (1539)*: *Riv. Numismat.*, XVIII. (1905). The pieces worth 10 bajocchi were called "Paoli" after the Pope.

⁴ Cf. the reproductions in CIACONIUS, III., 555.

Alessandro Cesati, called "il Grechetto," Giovanni Giacomo Bonzagni, Pietro Paolo Galeotto, and Leone Leoni.¹ The last named was a man quite of the stamp of Benvenuto Cellini, who began well under Paul III., but later on had serious trouble through his coming into conflict with Pier Luigi Farnese. Cellini's imprisonment in St. Angelo in October 1538, on a charge of having embezzled Papal jewels to the value of 80,000 ducats in the reign of Clement VII., his bold attempt at flight at the last moment and its mis-carriage, his terrible detention in the lowest dungeon of the fortress, and his final deliverance in November 1539, through the intercession of Cardinal Ippolito d' Este and Francis I., are all so well known from his autobiography as to call for no further description here.²

Like Cellini, his enemy Leone Leoni, who is said, against his will, to have saved the former's life, was also forced to leave Rome. On account of a murderous assault on the Papal jeweller, Pellegrino di Leuti, he was condemned to lose his right hand, but was saved from this punishment through the influence of powerful patrons. He was sent to the galleys instead, from which at the end of a year he was released on the entreaty of Andrea

¹ See MÜNTZ, *L'Atelier monétaire de Rome*, Paris, 1884, 37 *seq.*; GORI, *Archivio*, I., 95 *seq.*, 110 *seq.*, 113 *seq.*; *cf.* *Atti Mod.*, II., 254 *seq.*; III., 9 *seq.*; IV., 1 *seqq.*; VI., 1 *seq.*, 202 *seq.*; BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Lomb.*, I., 282 *seq.*, 301 *seq.*, 305 *seq.*, 316 *seq.*; *Artisti Mod.*, 69 *seq.*; ARMAND, I., 149, 165 *seq.*, 171 *seq.*, 223 *seq.*; II., 166 *seq.*, 296. For Cellini's scudo d' oro, see also PLON, 199; CASTELLANI, *Lo Scudo d' Oro di Paolo III.*, conio di B. Cellini, London, 1903; VITALINI in the *Riv. Ital. di numismat.*, 1907.

² Cellini Vita, ed. BACCI, 142 *seq.*, 197 *seqq.*; PLON, Cellini, 28 *seqq.*; BERTOLOTTI in *Arch. Stor. Lomb.*, II. (1875), 121 *seq.*, and *Artisti Lomb.*, I., 253 *seq.*; GORI, *Archivio*, I., 101 *seq.*, 109; BENIGNI, *Miscell.*, V., 166 *seq.* For the date of liberation, see CASANOVA in the *Miscell. fiorent. d' erudiz. e di storia*, II., 22 *seq.*

Doria. Leoni thereupon entered the service of the mint of Milan.¹

Alessandro Cesati, who was also famous as a carver of gems, was introduced into the family and service of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese by Annibale Caro, and obtained through the former the post of a "maestro delle stampe" in the Roman mint. He was also employed by Pier Luigi and Ottavio Farnese on the coinage of Castro and Camerino. Cesati designed a medal with a portrait of Paul III. and a representation of Alexander the Great in the Temple at Jerusalem, of which no less a judge than Michael Angelo remarked that "the art must be near its downfall, since it could reach no greater perfection than this."² Cesati's fellow-countrymen, Lorenzo Marmitta and the famous Valerio Belli, were rivals in the art of working intaglios on crystal.³ Belli received, in 1545, 1200 scudi for a cross together with two candlesticks and paxes.⁴ The clock-maker Cherubino had acquired so great a reputation in his business that even Cellini was forced to acknowledge it.

In the studios of the painters there was great activity, for in this domain Paul III.'s patronage was exercised in the most various directions. His first step was to gather together again the school of Raphael scattered after the sack. He gave special commissions to Perino del Vaga, as well as to his pupils the Romans, Luzio and Girolamo Sermoneta. Giovanni da Udine also returned to Rome.

¹ See VASARI, VII., 535 *seq.*; BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Lomb.*, I., 298 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, *L'Atelier monét.*, 41 *seq.*; PLON, L. Leoni, Paris, 1887; *Jahrbuch der Kunstsamml. des österr. Kaiserhauses*, V., 68 *seq.*; XIII., 55 *seq.*

² See BONANNI, 199; *Atti Mod.*, II., 254 *seq.*

³ For V. Belli see our statements, Vol. VIII. of this work, 356, and Vol. X., 358; for Marmitta see *Period. di numismat.*, VI., 6.

⁴ BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 197.

Perino del Vaga enjoyed special favour with the Farnese family, and from 1544 onwards the Pope gave him a monthly allowance of 25 scudi.¹ Vaga took an important part in the decoration of the Sala Regia as well as in that of the Castle of St. Angelo.² He also executed the pictures on the entablature under the frescoes of the Stanza della Segnatura,³ and in 1546-1547 decorated with paintings a Loggia in the Vatican.⁴ Like other eminent painters, he did not disdain work of a less pretentious kind, such as the painting of banners;⁵ he drew designs for carpets, church vestments, and all sorts of minor departments of art.⁶ The ceaseless labours of his hand were cut short by death in 1547, while he was still in the prime of manhood. Vaga was laid to rest in the Pantheon near to his master Raphael.⁷

Near this church, in 1542, a corporate guild of artists had been founded after the manner of the Association of St. Luke.⁸ The founder of this "Congregazione Ponteficia dei Virtuosi al Pantheon" was Desiderio d' Adjutorio, an

¹ See ZAHN in Arch. Stor. Ital., 3rd series, VI., 189: *cf.* *Tes. seg., 1544, f. 21, etc.; *cf. ibid.*, 1547, f. 155 (State Archives, Rome).

² *Cf. supra*, p. 576 *seq.*

³ *Cf.* VASARI, V., 623; CHATTARD, II., 222; PLATNER, II., 242 *seq.*

⁴ Payment for stucco-work and painting in the "loggia di mezzo del palazzo" to Perino del Vaga, 1546-1547, in the *Edif. publ., 1542-1548 (State Archives, Rome).

⁵ *1541, May 21: "duc. 300 mag. Perino del Vaga et sociis pictoribus pro complemento; scut. 650 pro pictura facta in banderiis seu vexillis arcis s. Angeli et aliis" (Tes. seg., 1541, f. 83). *1546, Apr. 12: "Magistro Pierino del Vaga pictori duc. auri nonaginta sex de paulis X. pro ducato pro pretio picturae sexaginta quattuor drappellorum ad usum cappellae majoris Suae St^{is} per ipsum pict." (Mand., 1546, f. 45, etc.); *cf.* also BERTOLOTTI, Artisti Veneti, 18, and Artisti Bolog., 37, 39.

⁶ See MÜNTZ, Hist., III., 544.

⁷ FORCELLA, I., 269, and the writing of Visconti (p. 67), as cited *infra*, p. 602, n. 1.

⁸ *Cf.* MISSIRINI, Mem. dell' Acad. di S. Luca, Roma, 1823, 13 *seq.*

official in the Papal Chancery and canon of the aforesaid church, of which the second chapel on the left was dedicated to St. Joseph and appropriated to the uses of the new corporation. Their aim was defined as the increase of God's glory and the elevation of the Holy Church. Their patron was St. Joseph; their motto was "Florent in Domino." In the pillared hall of the Pantheon their works were exhibited yearly on St. Joseph's Day.¹ The worthy canon made it his avowed object to win over his artist friends, whose course of life was often far from serious, to better things, and to induce them to introduce into their work a Christian rather than a pagan spirit. Besides Perino del Vaga, among the first members were Antonio and Giovan Battista da Sangallo, Jacopo Melegghino, the great architect and sculptor Giovanni Mangone, the engineer Clementi Dentocambi, and the wood-carver Antonio della Banda. After the founder's death he was probably followed in the presidency by Antonio da Sangallo, while the secretary was Mario Antonio Labacco.²

Sebastiano del Piombo painted at the beginning of the reign a portrait of Paul III., which has, however, disappeared; the only other known work of this period by Sebastiano, who up to his death on the 21st of June 1547 was one of the Piombatori of the Papal leaden bulls, is the noble portrait of Cardinal Pole.³ In 1540 Francesco Primaticcio came to Rome to make copies of antique sculpture for Francis I. and to purchase works of art.⁴

¹ Cf. VISCONTI'S treatise based on the Acta of the Archives of the Congregazione: Sulla istituzione della insigne artistica congregazione ponteficia dei virtuosi al Pantheon, Roma, 1869.

² Cf. VISCONTI, *loc. cit.*, II, 16, 31.

³ D'ACHIARDI, Sebast. del Piombo, Roma, 1908, 286, 288, 292, 337.

⁴ He engaged his fellow-countryman Vignola to help him (see WILlich, 20).

An event in the artistic world of Rome was the appearance of Titian in April 1543, when he painted a portrait of the Pope. In the autumn of 1545 he paid a second visit; when Paul III. appointed him a residence in the Belvedere the jealousy of the other painters was at once aroused. Neither then, however, nor two years later was there any employment of the greatest colourist of his time.¹ Consequently, to painters of the second and third rank, mostly Tuscans, the chief tasks were allotted. The most important among them was Daniele da Volterra. A pupil of Sodoma and Peruzzi, he worked with them on the decoration of the Sala Regia; in 1547 he succeeded Vaga, with a monthly salary of 20 scudi.² Volterra at this time had already completely passed under the influence of Michael Angelo, as is clearly shown in the Descent from the Cross painted by him for the chapel in the Trinita de' Monti founded by Elena Orsini. This picture, now unfortunately much damaged, was justly celebrated in its day; it is a composition remarkable for dramatic movement and certainty of drawing.³

Like Daniele da Volterra, Giulio Vasari of Arezzo was also under the enchantment of Michael Angelo. Paolo Giovio and Bindo Altoviti had in January 1543 called Cardinal Alessandro Farnese's attention to this painter, who owes his reputation less to his compositions as an

¹ VASARI, VII., 446; Atti Mod., II., 131 *seq.*; BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 186, 187, and Artisti Veneti, 18; CROWE, Titian, II., 471 *seq.*; CLAUSSE, Farnese, 23 *seq.*, 72 *seq.*, 196 *seq.*; GRONAU, Titian, 129 *seq.*, 140. Titian's letter to Charles V., dat. Rome, Dec. 8, 1545, in FILLON, Inventaire des autographes, Paris, 1877 *seq.*, 2097. Titian's nomination as a Roman citizen took place on Mar. 20, 1546 (see GREGOROVIVS, Kleine Schriften, I., 302).

² BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 204.

³ Cf. REUMONT, III., 2nd ed., 725; Allgem. Zeitung, 1858, No. 217.

artist than to his *Lives of the Painters*, a work which appeared a year after the death of Paul III.¹

A representation of Justice executed in oils for the Cardinal by this painter pleased his patron so much that he also commissioned him to decorate with frescoes the great court-room of the Palace of the Cancelleria. This work was intended to be carried out as a surprise for the Cardinal on his return from his German mission, which was to be celebrated as a great triumph. Vasari worked at full speed: only a hundred days had been spent in bringing the task to completion on the 23rd of November 1546. "You can see that by looking at them," was Michael Angelo's opinion of the frescoes. Giovio himself, who was Vasari's personal friend, had to admit that the portraiture which had been freely introduced left much to be desired.² Nevertheless, these paintings illustrative of the age of Paul III. are not by any means without interest, and are at the same time the forerunners of those in the castle of Caprarola.³

On the left side wall is represented the Apostolic Court of Chancery as it was under Paul III., the founder, as the inscription states, of the Golden Age.⁴ The Pope, clad in pluviale and camauro, sits on a throne and presents to a figure kneeling at his feet bulls and rescripts. By his side are the presidents of the Chancery and Dataria, Cardinals

¹ See *supra*, p. 530; Atti Mod., II., 121 *seq.*

² See Atti Mod., II., 125 *seq.*; *cf.* KALLAB, 76 *seq.*, 145 *seq.* The court-room was called from the frescoes the "Sala dei centi giorni."

³ The frescoes were reproduced in the periodical *Catholicum Riv. Illustr.*, Roma, 1899, Vol. I., Part 3, p. 11 *seqq.* The explanations are not always apposite, and the inscriptions are not fully given. Since the latter are also wanting in Forcella, and as far as I know are only to be found in a few private copies, I give them in the following notes.

⁴ Aureum saeculum condit || qui || recto aequabilique ordine || cuncta dispensat.

Alessandro Farnese and Guidiccioni. In the foreground are figures in the act of making petitions or offering gifts—among the latter strange animals even are introduced, such as a giraffe, an elephant, and two camels; in the immediate front of the picture an allegorical figure of the Tiber lies stretched, who is crowned by Romulus and Remus. On each side of the fresco two allegorical figures are painted. The inscriptions declare them to be Justice and Eloquence.¹ On the corresponding left wall, where the entrance door is placed, Paul's reconciliation of Charles V. and Francis I. at Nice is celebrated. The Pope appears on the *Sedia Gestatoria* and blesses the monarchs, who are surrounded by their retinues, as they make their pact of peace. The two allegorical figures are repeated on both sides of this fresco, and represent Love and Concord.²

Of the two great frescoes on the principal wall one commemorates the nominations to the Cardinalate in which Paul III. rewarded true merit. The scene is a church, with pillars copied from those in St. Peter's, and reputed to have once been in the Temple of Jerusalem. Portraits of the great men who are receiving the purple fill the composition—Contarini, Sadoletto, Bembo, Pole. Many other likenesses are introduced, among others that of Giovio, who composed

¹ Under Justice: *Maiestati ac ditioni || vim tuetur || et fidem conciliat.* Under Eloquence: *Segnes animos || excitat iratos || mulcet.* Above on this wall are the arms of Paul III. and busts of Cæsar and Alexander with the inscriptions: *Expedito vigore animi || cuncta pervicit,* and: *Supra Garamantas et Indos || protulit imperium.*

² Under the principal picture one reads: *In pace || optimaæ artes excoluntur || ingenia ad frugem coalescunt || publicæ privataeque opes || augentur;* under Charity: *Christianæ pietatis || perfectum specimen || ostendit;* under Concord: *Res parvas auget || et insuperabiles reddit.* Above on this wall are the arms of Charles V. and the busts of Titus and Augustus, with the inscriptions: *Templum pacis condidit,* and: *Janum clausit.*

the inscription, and of Michael Angelo, as the greatest painter in the Pope's employment. In the foreground is the figure of disappointed Envy, who is devouring snakes. The whole is crowned by the arms of the Farnese upheld by Fame and Virtue.¹ At the sides of this fresco the figure of Goodness is introduced.²

The other fresco of the principal wall is certainly the most interesting of the whole group. Paul III. here appears as the patron of art. Vasari has given expression to this idea by representing the Pope in the act of issuing commands with a gesture of great earnestness to the kneeling females, who are the allegorical figures of Painting, Sculpture, and Architecture. Paul III. is strangely clad as the high priest of the Old Testament Scriptures. Vasari chose this unusual garb in order to celebrate the Pope's great work of the reconstruction of St. Peter's. The plan of this Temple of the New Covenant, destined to cast the sanctuary of Jerusalem into the shade, is spread before the Pope. Sangallo's sketch is plainly recognizable. In the background the new buildings of the Basilica are prominent, thronged with busy workers, while beasts of burden drag forward the building materials. This representation is very interesting, as it shows how far Sangallo had advanced with the building of the new St. Peter's up to the time of his death. It shows the area of the south cross, afterwards removed by Michael Angelo, the provisional choir of Bramante, the barrel roof of the south cross only just finished and still covered with scaffolding,

¹ Under this fresco : *In summa fortuna || nihil praestantius || quam beneficii recte collati || memoriam || ad posteros extendisse.* A reproduction of the portrait of Michael Angelo in STEINMANN, II., 485, who intends to bring out a special publication of the frescoes.

² Under this is the inscription : *Viridi crescentique virtuti || ianuam pandit.*

and on the left an octagonal cupola. In the foreground is placed an aged man supporting himself with his left hand on the Holy Scriptures, while with one foot he tramples on two volumes which evidently contain false teaching. This allegorical figure of Papal Rome as the shepherd of true doctrine holds in one hand the keys, in the other the triple tiara, while a genius crowns the head with laurel. At the sides of this fresco¹ two symbolical figures again appear: Superstition and Religion with the keys and the threefold crown.² Under the last figure runs an inscription relating how Vasari executed his great task in the space of a hundred days.³

In accordance with the stricter spirit of the times, the female figures in these frescoes are clad in drapery. The decorations also in the apartments of the Cancelleria reserved by Cardinal Farnese for his own use show no heathen emblems, hitherto the choice of princes of the Church, but are taken from subjects in sacred history. Much has been altered or destroyed at a later period, but the roof and frieze of the study still remain undisturbed. This apartment was called the "camera della Genesi," from the pictures of the Creation with which it was adorned.

¹ The inscription under this is: *Magnificentiae studium || cum praeclara pietate coniunctum || mortales coelo infert.* Above, the busts of Trajan, Numa, and Agrippa, with the inscriptions: *Mentis honoribus || Quirites exornavit || ferocem victoriis populum || inducta religione || feliciter || rexit, and: Ter cons. Pantheon extruxit.*

² The inscription under Opulence runs: *Optimo cuique || exercendae virtutis || instrumentum;* under Religion: *Diis homines proximos || facit.*

³ *Alexandro Farnesio card. vicecancell. || iubente || quam expediti operis picturam non abs re nata || praeceps occasio postularet || Georgius Aretinus centesimo die ita munus absolvit || ut properantem obsequendi necessitas iure excuset || nisi mira celeritas augeat dignitatem || MDXLVI.*

Here Perino del Vaga has displayed a Raphaelesque grace in pictures of a "genre" character. The ceilings of the study and the chapel are both masterpieces.¹ The chapel decoration came from the pencil of Francesco de' Rossi named Salviati.² According to an entry in the accounts, he also painted the chamber before the "guardaroba" in the Vatican, and a representation of King Pepin.³

Among the many other artists⁴ then at work in Rome special mention should be made of the illuminators Vincenzo Raimondi and Giulio Clovio,⁵ as well as of the painter on glass, Pastorino, who was also distinguished as engraver of coins and medals; unfortunately, the windows with which this talented Siense adorned the Sala Regia have not been preserved.⁶

The names enumerated above do not, however, exhaust the artistic chronicle of the Papal Court. The masterpiece of painting which owed its existence to Paul III. remains to be considered, the Last Judgment of Michael Angelo.

Clement VII., the second Pope of the house of Medici, can claim the merit of having first suggested this subject

¹ See BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER, *Gesch. der Renaissance*, 356 *seq.*

² These paintings are also reproduced in the periodical *Catholicum*, Vol. I., 5th Part, p. 10 *seqq.*; *cf.* VASARI, VII., 31.

³ See *Arch. Stor. Ital.*, 3rd Series, VI., 188.

⁴ *Cf.* the fragments in BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 176, 178, 179, 180, 188, 191, 195, 203, 204, *Art. Belgi*, 42, and *Art. Lomb.*, I., 102 *seq.*

⁵ *Cf.* GORI, *Archivio*, IV., 110; MISSIRINI, *Accad. di S. Luca*, 55; MÜNTZ, *Biblioth.*, 97, 104 *seq.*, 108. For Clovio see our statements, Vol. X. of this work, 351, n. 3; SEIBT, *Studien zur Kunst und Kultur-gesch.*, III. (1891), 7. For the Psalter supplied to Paul III. in 1542 (Fonds lat. 8880, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) see MÜNTZ, *Hist.*, III., 719. A breviary containing more than a hundred fine illuminations, once belonging to Card. A. Farnese, is in the National Library, Naples.

⁶ *Cf.* *Atti Mod.*, V., 39 *seqq.*; MÜNTZ, *Atelier monét.*, 47 *seq.*; *Jahrbuch des österr. Kaiserhauses*, XII., 87 *seq.*

to the great painter.¹ But the glory of its achievement belongs to the reign of Paul III., at whose instigation this work of incomparable majesty and dramatic power was executed, forming the keystone to the monumental fabric of the art of the Italian Renaissance.

Very few accounts, unfortunately, exist of the genesis of this gigantic fresco, which displays the consummation of the Divine Creation upon earth. It is certain that the work in the Chapel could not have begun earlier than the period between April the 10th and May the 18th, 1536, since not only had the huge scaffolding to be erected, but the altar wall also to be prepared.² All the frescoes here existing, the Assumption, the Nativity, and the Finding of Moses, as well as two lunettes painted by the master under the Jonas, had to make room for the new creation with its titanic proportions. According to Vasari, the wall was also covered with a thin layer of burnt brick projecting slightly at the top, so that dust and soil might be prevented from injuring the surface of the picture.³

In the Papal brief of the 1st of September 1535 the cartoons are spoken of as begun. The proposal of Sebastiano del Piombo that the picture should be executed in oil was rejected by Michael Angelo, as were all other offers of help; he was determined to work in fresco and to work single-handed. With the exception of the faithful Francesco Amatori, named Urbino, who mixed his colours, he had no one by his side.⁴

The devotion with which the old man flung himself into

¹ Cf. our statements, Vol. X. of this work, 363.

² See STEINMANN, II., 489, and DOREZ in the treatise cited *infra*, p. 610, n. 3.

³ See VASARI, VII., 209; STEINMANN, II., 489.

⁴ F. Amatori received from the Pope monthly 4 scudi (see POGAT-SCHER in Steinmann, II., 769).

his work is shown from the number of drawings and sketches still in existence; the original cartoon, on the other hand, has disappeared.¹

Paul III. watched the progress of the work with impatience. In January 1537 he was already urging on its completion,² and on the 4th of February 1537 he appeared at its inspection in the Sistine Chapel.³ In other parts of Italy as well the greatest interest had been aroused. Pietro Aretino, the trifler, had the audacity to try and impose a sort of programme on the painter in a letter of the 15th of September 1537, filled with exuberant praise. The reply was polite but cold. Michael Angelo declined to allow his work to be influenced by fantastic conceptions of the Last Judgment; besides, his painting was by this time almost finished.⁴ This was unquestionably an exaggeration; four full years had yet to pass before the fresco could be uncovered.⁵

Ecclesiastical functions in the Chapel were not impeded for any great length of time by the work of Michael Angelo. As far as can be established, there was only one

¹ See SPRINGER, 121; STEINMANN, II., 605 *seq.*; THODE, V., 5 *seqq.*

² G. M. della Porta reported on Jan. 21, 1537, to the Duke of Urbino: "Michelangelo m' ha promesso di far ad ogni modo il cavallo che V.S. gli dimanda fra 15 giorni non ostante la perpetua solecitudine che gli fa il papa di quella sua pictura di capella" (State Archives, Florence). *Cf.* GRONAU in *Jahrb. der preuss. Kunstsamml.*, XXVII., Supplement 8.

³ See DOREZ in the *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscript. et belles lettres*, 1905, Mars-Avril, 234-235.

⁴ MILANESI, *Lettere*, 472; Aretino's letter in BOTTARI, III., 86.

⁵ On Nov. 26, 1537, G. M. della Porta reported to the Duke of Urbino: "Pigliai tempo e modo di parlar con Michelangelo, del quale difficilmente si po haver copia stando continuamente occupato alla pictura della capella di Sisto" (State Archives, Florence). *Cf.* GRONAU, *loc. cit.*, Supplement 9, and THODE, V., 4.

actual interruption, in November 1538; during the interval Paul III. made use of the Hall of the Popes as a domestic chapel,¹ as Sixtus IV. had done formerly.

In December 1540 the upper portion of the colossal picture was at last finished, and admitted of the removal of the scaffolding.² Then undoubtedly the work was inspected by the Pope. On this occasion also the incident related in Vasari's well-known anecdote must surely have taken place. The Papal master of the ceremonies, Blasius de Martinellis, objected to the number of nude figures in the composition, and the painter took his revenge by portraying Blasius under the form of Minos. When the personage thus caricatured complained to the Pope, the latter replied that he could give no redress as his authority did not extend over hell. As Condivi says nothing of this episode, and the head of Minos is not a portrait at all, the authenticity of the story is not to be depended upon.³

The completion of the lower portion occupied Michael Angelo for a whole year. With what fiery energy he flung his whole strength into the work, heedless of the heat of the Roman summer, is shown indirectly by his letter of

¹ Cf. POGATSCHER'S investigations, *loc. cit.*, 775.

² The payment was made on Dec. 15, 1540 (see POGATSCHER in Steinmann, II., 769).

³ Against KALLAB (*loc. cit.*, 7), STEINMANN (II., 511) has tried to substantiate the assumption on the authority of another independent source (L. DOMENICHI, *Facetie*, Firenze, 1562, 242). He overlooks, however, the circumstance on which Kallab lays so much stress, that Minos is not a portraiture at all. In favour of Kallab there is also the circumstance that Domenichi attributes the altercation to the curiosity of Blasius de Martinellis, who wished to see the picture at too early a stage. Any unwarranted intrusion into the Chapel is out of the question, as the Chief Master of the Ceremonies had the right, if anyone had, to go in and out of the Sistine at all times.

the 25th of August 1541.¹ Not until the autumn, when the scaffolding would be taken down, could he draw a breath of relief.² The solemn uncovering of the fresco took place on the eve of All Saints, October the 31st, 1541. Paul III., who had returned from Bologna only the day before, celebrated Mass on this occasion.³

Just as nine-and-twenty years before, when the ceiling was exposed to view, all Rome had streamed into the Chapel, so now a vast concourse came together to gaze on the marvel on the walls. If the impression made on the former occasion was powerful, that impression was now surpassed. The work deceived and exceeded all expectations. They were deceived in so far as this new representation of the Doom was essentially different from all that had been painted before; they were exceeded, for even the most vivid phantasy could not have conjured up anything bolder or more powerful.⁴ The feeling was general that this majestic effort represented in more than one aspect an epoch in the development of art. Henceforward the fresco became an object of study. It was drawn, it was copied, it became the centre of an active interest which Michael Angelo observed with peculiar feelings; he is said to have exclaimed, "What a crop of fools this work of mine will produce!"⁵

In spite of the strangeness of the style, the general attitude of the public towards the fresco was one of unqualified admiration. The Florentine, Niccolò Martelli,

¹ MILANESI, Lettere, 167.

² The payments on Nov. 19, 1541, for taking down the scaffolding are in POGATSCHER, *loc. cit.*, 770.

³ See the evidence of Gualterius in EHSSES, IV., 210, n. 2, and POGATSCHER in Repertorium für Kunstwissensch., XXIX., 398.

⁴ See KEPPLER, 253.

⁵ See STEINMANN, II., 519.

wrote, full of enthusiasm, to the painter on the 4th of December 1541: "What can I say? Has not God through you given to us a perfect picture of the dreadful judgment of mankind in that fresco which you have just unveiled? He who has only seen it once is amazed, and he who has heard it spoken of rests not until he has seen it. And when at last the longed-for vision meets his eye, he finds that the renown of it is indeed great and undying, but the work itself still greater and divine."¹ "He who has not seen it," says another Florentine, "cannot imagine it."² The poets who, according to the custom of the time, wrote encomiums on the works of the famous artist could hardly find language adequate to express their appreciation of this latest achievement of his old age. "O sacred Rome!" cried Gandolfo Porrino in a sonnet, "never did Cæsar or Emperor renowned of old ever make thee glad with such a triumph as this."³

Hostile criticism, however, was not wanting. It has hitherto been supposed that this was started by Aretino in

¹ See *Il primo libro delle lettere di N. Martelli* (1546), 8; *cf.* also STEINMANN, II., 513.

² *Animo Fiorentino*, ed. FREY, 127.

³ See STEINMANN, II., 513; *cf.* FREY, *Dichtungen*, 272. The following is the epigram, still unpublished, of H. Borgia ad Michaelam Angelum Flo. :—

Cum Deus extremam trepidis mortalibus horam
 Vellet et horrificum pandere iudicium
 Ac terrere homines, ne digna perennibus olim
 Suppliciis peccent, regna sed alta petant :
 Angele magne, tuum divino numine pectus
 Imbuit artifices edocuitque manus,
 Ut tu, qualis erit lux illa tremenda, figuris
 Exprimeres veris consuleresque polo.

(Cod. Barb. lat., 1903, f. 20, Vatican Library.) A poem by Steuco on the Last Judgment is mentioned by TIRABOSCHI (VII., I, 318).

the year 1545, but an unpublished letter from Nino Sernini to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga of the 19th of November 1541 shows that immediately after the uncovering of the fresco a strong opposition was aroused. This came from the Cardinals of the strict party of reform, who declared that entirely naked figures were unfitted for the decoration of the house of God. Sernini considered this censure unjustified, as among the many hundred figures represented only ten could be pointed out the nudity of which was objectionable. He also mentions other strictures: that Christ was beardless, had too youthful an appearance, and lacked majesty. The fault-finders were, however, in the minority. Cardinal Cornaro was spoken of as specially friendly to the fresco, and as having said that if Michael Angelo would only paint for him one single figure out of the many, he would give him any price he chose to ask. Cornaro at once commissioned a painter to make for him a faithful copy of the work,¹ and Cardinal Gonzaga also took immediate steps to procure a replica. Sernini drew his master's attention to a young painter from Mantua, who stood in need of help, Marcello Venusti; among the many copyists of the fresco he is the best.² Venusti was also afterwards ordered by Cardinal Farnese, who had a keen artistic sense, to make a copy for him.³ This work,

¹ See the text of this important *letter in Appendix No. 9 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). This as well as that of December 4 has hitherto escaped all notice, having been introduced wrongly into the Roman correspondence of Paul V. A very laconic refusal of the fresco belonging to the year 1544 in Arch. Stor. Ital., 5th Series, XII., 280, 281.

² See in Appendix No. 10 N. Sernini's *letter of Dec. 4, 1541 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

³ See BERTOLOTTI, *Speserie*, 211; *cf.* LANCIANI, *Scavi*, II., 160; VASARI, VII., 575; NOLHAC in the *Studi e doc.*, V., 251. For the copy of the "Mortal Sins," by Vasari, see KALLAB, *Vasaristudien*, 72.

now in Naples, is the original from which most of the reduced reproductions of the Last Judgment have been taken. By means of copper plates the fresco soon became popularized.¹ These plates and Venusti's copy have a special interest, inasmuch as they render faithfully the original composition of the fresco prior to the touching up and destruction which, at a later period, it underwent.

No one certainly ventured to take liberties with the work during the lifetime of Paul III. How little the Pope shared the objections thus brought forward is shown by the circumstance that in October 1543 he appointed a special superintendent for the preservation of the paintings in the Sistine, the Sala Regia, and the Cappella Paolina. This post was bestowed upon Francesco Amatori, a competent person, at a monthly salary of six ducats. It would be his duty, so ran the deed of appointment, to protect all the fine frescoes, put up at a great cost by the Apostolic See, from dust and every kind of damage and from the fumes of smoke from the candles which had to be burned during divine service in both chapels.² The opposition, however, was not silenced; it must have gathered considerable strength, since in November 1545 Aretino, whose ear was quick to catch the dominant note in public opinion, ventured to give expression to its voice in the harshest and most injurious way. There was certainly no one in Italy who was more unfitted to be the custodian of morality than this man, whose scandalous life corresponded to his shameless writings. In April 1544 Aretino had already assured Michael Angelo, in a letter asking for drawings, that the sight of a copy of the Last Judgment had affected him to tears.³ When the painter refused to comply with

¹ See STEINMANN, II., 517 *seq.*; THODE, V., 17 *seqq.*

² See POGATSCHER in Steinmann, II., 757 *seq.*

³ See BOTTARI, Lettere, III., 114; GUHL, I., 149.

further requests of the importunate writer the latter, whose vanity had been sorely wounded by the incident of 1537, began to think of revenge. This he took by means of a disgraceful invective in which, while feigning moral indignation at the outrage on decency inflicted by the fresco, he accused the master of impiety and irreligion.¹ Michael Angelo met the attack with the silent contempt which in such cases is the best weapon.

Paul III. had not the slightest intention of complying with Aretino's demand that he should take measures similar to those employed by Gregory the Great against heathen statues. But in other quarters, on the contrary, Aretino's invectives² fell on willing ears. In the "open letter" composed by an Italian Protestant, Paul III. was reproached for having placed in a chapel a picture which would have found a worthier destination in a wayside drinking-house.³ The same reproach recurs in a satirical Italian sonnet which corresponds to this letter in the grossness of its contents.⁴ The enemies of the Pope knew what they were about when they sought to attack him on this point: public opinion was beginning to be much more strict with regard to the use of nude human forms in painting and sculpture.

In the spring of 1549 an opposition arose in Florence directed against Bandinelli's statues of Adam and Eve, works certainly entirely unfitted for a church, in which Michael Angelo was sharply attacked as the originator of objectionable subjects for art. References were made to

¹ See GAYE, II., 332 *seq.*; GUHL, I., 150.

² See the letter of year 1547 in BOTTARI, III., 152; *cf.* GASPARY, II., 478, 686.

³ See CANTÙ, II., 61; *cf. supra*, p. 513.

⁴ **Sonetto: "Guiditio di Michel Angelo Fiorentino" among the Pasquilli in Cod. Ottob., 2811, f. 73, of the Vatican Library.

painters and sculptors who had Lutheran sympathies, to works of art which undermined faith and piety.¹

In the oration on Art composed under Aretino's influence by Lodovico Dolce in honour of Titian in 1557, the Last Judgment in the Sixtine Chapel was severely censured on account of the indelicate treatment of the female form, the complete disregard of drapery, and the uniformity of tone therein exhibited.²

According to the statement of Vasari,³ hitherto accepted by all students, the austere Paul IV. was the first who gave orders that the offensive nudities in the Last Judgment should be painted over. Evidence for this, however, has not yet been adduced. As a matter of fact, a very considerable space of time elapsed before the stage of painting-over was reached. It was not until the reign of Pius IV. that the demands of the strict reform party were put into execution.

On the 6th of September 1561, Scipione Saurolo transmitted to Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, a memorial intended for the Pope, inveighing against the Last Judgment. The fresco, so ran this document, must be an object of holy hatred, since it offends the Divine Majesty, for the nudities in it so predominate that even many admirers deplore this feature. Where on earth, asks Saurolo, in colour or in stone, has anyone seen such representations of the Lord God? Who ever looked upon a painting of that last dread judgment in which the bark of Acheron was depicted? ⁴

¹ See CANTÙ, II., 280; GAYE, II., 500; TACCHI VENTURI, I., 87; Riv. bibliogr., XVII., 89.

² Cf. PLATNER, II., I, 276; GASPARY, II., 468.

³ VASARI, VII., 65, 240.

⁴ Although mentioned in CANTÙ (II., 280), this letter has been passed over by all writers on the Last Judgment. Researches for the original in the Archiepiscopal Archives in Milan have unfortunately led to no result.

There is no doubt that representations of this kind influenced the strong regulations which the Council of Trent, in the twenty-fifth and final session of the 3rd of December 1563, passed concerning pictures unfitted for exhibition in churches. The work of Michael Angelo was now spared only a little time longer from the brush of the improver. The master, who died on the 18th of February 1564, was probably not aware of the decision of the Congregation of the Council on January the 21st, that the objectionable naked figures in the pictures of the Sistine Chapel should be painted over, and in other churches unseemly or evidently false representations destroyed.¹ As it was desirable that this decision should be executed as sparingly as possible, the work was entrusted to a pupil of Michael Angelo, Daniele da Volterra, of whom it was expected that he would limit himself to alterations that were absolutely necessary. Daniele, who earned for himself from this commission the nickname of the "breeches painter," died in 1566, and Girolamo da Fano carried on the work of emendation.²

As it was the good fortune of Michael Angelo to pass away before hands were laid upon his work, so also was he spared the knowledge of the, in part, totally unfounded attack on the Last Judgment delivered by Giovanni Andrea Gilio in his *Two Dialogues*, published at

¹ The important *decision of the Congregatio Concilii Trid. of Jan. 21, 1546, hitherto unknown, was to this effect: "Picturae in capella Apostolica coperiantur, in aliis autem ecclesiis deleantur, si quae obscenum aut evidenter falsum ostendant, juxta decretum secundum in Sess. 9 sub Pio" (Conc. 9, f. 80, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² VASARI, VII., 240, n. 1; STEINMANN, II., 515 *seq.* Here mention is made of the danger which the Last Judgment incurred under Gregory XIII.; not, however, the same danger that arose under Clement VIII. (see MISSIRINI, Mem. d. Accad. d. S. Luca, Roma, 1823, 69).

Camerino in 1564. "For the sake of his art," says Gilio, "Michael Angelo disregarded reverence and even historical truth itself, and despised the awe which attaches by right to this stupendous mystery."¹

If Gilio went too far in his strictures, the Venetian Inquisition at a later date went to the opposite extreme in their defence of Michael Angelo. When in 1573 Paolo Veronese was cited before this tribunal on account of his picture of the banquet in the house of Levi, he appealed to that serious master Michael Angelo. The Inquisition retorted on him, "Do you not know that in a painting of the Last Judgment, where all must be unclothed, no clothes need be introduced? What is there, then, in these figures that has not been inspired by the Holy Ghost?"²

In Rome other opinions prevailed. Under Sixtus V. further effacements were made of objectionable portions of the Last Judgment.³ The last work of this sort was undertaken under Clement XIII.⁴

These repeated repaintings were carried out for the most part on the upper part of the fresco. The two lunettes, with hovering figures of angels bearing the instruments

¹ See STEINMANN, II., 555 *seq.*; *cf.* PLATNER, II., I, 227, 286, and KRAUS-SAUER, II., 548 n., who very rightly finds fault with Gilio for his entirely misplaced quibbling. See also THODE, V., 68.

² P. Veronese's trial was first translated into French by BASCHET in the *Gaz. des beaux Arts*, 1867, and into German in ZAHN, *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft.*, I., 82 *seq.*; there is an Italian version by CALIARI (P. Veronese, Rome, 1888). The passage in question is given here, p. 104; KRAUS-SAUER (II., 548 *seq.*) attaches altogether too much importance to it (see KEPPLER, 274 *seq.*). The whole matter was also not so obscure as SAUER supposes, since GUHL had dealt with it in his well-known *Künstlerbriefen* (II., 363 *seq.*), and J. GRAUS (*Der Kirchenschmuck*, XXIV., 90, Graz) had called attention to it in 1893.

³ Cesare Nebbia was paid in 1586 "per aver coperto certe cose vergognose" (see BERTOLOTTI, *Artisti Mod.*, 32).

⁴ See STEINMANN, II., 541.

of the Passion, underwent stringent handling. By the alteration of the colouring of the background this portion seems now entirely separated from the central group, with which it was in close combination. In the figures surrounding Adam individual parts of the body have been broadened in an arbitrary manner. Still worse is the disappearance of the bank of cloud which, also on the left-hand side of the spectator, separated the upper from the lower section of the picture, whereby the figures of the saints there introduced have lost their foothold. In the lower part candle-smoke and incense have done much damage. Single heads which are still visible in the plates are now no longer recognizable in the fresco.

In consequence of all these disfigurements and alterations a judgment on the pictorial qualities of the fresco is no longer possible. The distribution of light and shade, which, calculated by the antemeridian light, brought all the masses of figures into a clearly organized membership, can now only be guessed at. Notwithstanding all these drawbacks the fresco overpowers the spectator, chains him by its enchantment, so that, like one spellbound, he becomes absorbed in the stupendous creation. The first impression made by this picture, sixty feet in height by thirty broad, on which Michael Angelo with unprecedented audacity has riveted his conceptions, is one of sheer bewilderment. It is only gradually that the eye at last finds its focus and sees clearly.¹

¹ Cf. BOLE'S descriptions (Meisterwerke der Malerei, Brixen, 1893, 95 *seq.*); STEINMANN (II., 534 *seqq.*) and KEPPLER (248 *seq.*). THODE (V., 49 *seqq.*) tries very cleverly to determine the individual figures, and thereby differs in many respects from CHAPON (Le dernier jugement de Michel Ange, Paris, 1892). I cannot, however, admit all his explanations, as he is too anxious to identify the figures with definite personages.

The central point of the whole composition is Christ, the Judge of all men, who appears in a golden blaze of glory. He had Himself declared that when He came again He would come in His Divine Majesty (Matt. xvi. 27; xxiv. 30; xxv. 31). His form is youthful and of herculean build. He is scantily draped, beardless, and with flowing hair. With His left hand He points reproachfully to the wound in His side. His right hand is uplifted high to reject and punish. He is the *Rex tremendæ majestatis*—the *Juste judex ultionis* as He is called by the Franciscan Thomas of Celano in his *Dies Iræ*. He is the Almighty in the act of springing from His throne of clouds to pronounce the sentence of eternal justice: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire" (Matt. xxv. 41). The day of wrath, of the avenging judgment, already foretold in the prophecies of the Old Testament (Isa. lxvi. 15 *seq.*; Joel ii. 29 *seq.*, iii. 2), and described in all its terrors in the *Dies Iræ* of the Church's Office for the Dead, has come at last. Like a lightning flash the appearing of the Judge thrills through the hundreds of forms portrayed in immeasurable and unspeakable fear. It is this emotion which dominates the whole composition. Every face is filled with anguish, dread, and horror. Even Mary, the ever-blessed Virgin and Mother of God, trembles. She turns away her head from the rejected souls to seek the glance of her Divine Son whose awful verdict fills with emotion the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and saints standing by His side. Two colossal figures here appear as the representatives of the Old and New Covenant; on the spectator's left hand¹ is Adam, on whose shoulders hangs the fell of some animal; on the right is Peter displaying the keys of the Church, entrusted to him as the faithful steward of the

¹ In the following description the spectator's right or left hand is always meant.

Lord. Around Adam are grouped the saints of the Old Testament: Abel, Moses, John the Baptist; with Peter are Paul and John. At the feet of Christ on the clouds St. Lawrence is seated, carrying his trophy of victory, the gridiron, and with him St. Bartholomew holding the implement of his martyrdom, the knife, in his right hand and in the left his skin as it had been flayed.

Above, into the further perspective, other forms of saints are soaring and complete the circle of figures which surround Christ like a garland. On both sides of this incomparable centrepiece appeared hosts of the blessed massed together, and all alike in deep emotion. On the left, women chiefly are represented in all stages of life, from childhood to hoary age. The foremost group is particularly striking. To a woman of massive form, absorbed in the contemplation of Christ, a young maiden clings for help. In like manner on the right a young man of herculean build advances with a cross, probably the good thief Dismas, as the representative of penitent sinners.¹ Further upon this side, corresponding to St. Lawrence and St. Bartholomew, are witnesses unto blood, sufferers exceedingly for the name of Christ, all with the symbols of their victory whereby they were made worthy of the Kingdom of Heaven. There are the Apostle Simon with his saw, St. Catherine with her wheel, St. Blaise with his hackle, St. Sebastian with his darts. These are the souls of those who, in the language of the Apocalypse, were slain for the word of God and His testimony, to which they held fast, and who cry with a loud voice, "How long, O Lord (holy and true), dost

¹ THODE (V., 59 *seq.*, 61) sees in the cross-bearer St. Francis of Assisi, and in the woman with the young girl, St. Mary Magdalen as patroness of penitent women. The latter explanation seems more appropriate than the former.

Thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Apoc. vi. 10).

In order to soften the shattering impression made by this group of martyrs the painter has introduced into the background touching pictures of the reunion of those who, closely linked together in this life, are now, after the lapse of ages, brought face to face in recognition; but here again also forms reappear quaking as they gaze upon their Judge in that hour, when the "just themselves shall tremble." Others in deep abasement accept their salvation as an unmerited grace, or express their thankfulness with uplifted arms; others again, filled with hope, stretch out their hands to Christ in supplication. While in pictures of the Judgment, as hitherto known to Christendom, the saints and martyrs were represented as calm spectators of the scene, all here to the further ranks appear under the influence of the most powerful emotion; with spellbound gaze all are drawn to the central figure of the Judge as He passes the sentence of eternal condemnation.

High above, in the two terminal half circles of the wall, bands of angels are borne along as if impelled by tempestuous winds. They are depicted as youths with powerful frames, unclothed and without wings. They carry the implements of the Passion: the crown of thorns, the scourge, the hyssop and the sponge, the ladder, the pillar of scourging and the cross, "the sign of the Son of man." On the right hand is the heavy column of stone, on the left the wood of the cross; each one a dumb yet eloquent indictment of those who, while on earth, neglected the fruits of Christ's Passion and on whom now the sentence of final damnation is passed.

The upper half of the picture, which represents the Judge in heaven re-echoing the sentence of condemnation, and the lower half where earth and hell appear,

are bound together by a group of angels who are again represented as muscular youths. They are the angels of the Apocalypse, blowing their trumpets, eight in number, terrible in aspect, summoning with their blasts the dead from all the corners of the earth, in the words of the *Dies Iræ*:—

Per sepulchra regionum
Coget omnes ante thronum.

With these awakeners of the dead three other figures are joined, with the books from which, according to the Apocalypse of St. John (xx. 12), the departed are to be judged by their works. Accordingly on one side is the great and weighty Book of Death, requiring two to uphold it, while on the other is the Book of Life, with the good works inscribed within it, held by one. The latter turns to the left. Here the just soar up to heaven aided by friends or are actually drawn on high by means of the chaplet of the rosary. This representation of the power of prayer to Mary, the help of Christians, points directly to Michael Angelo's Catholic feeling, which has been so strangely and so groundlessly impugned in connection with this very portrayal of the Last Judgment.¹

Underneath the resurrection of the blessed who, in the words of Holy Scripture, "shall be taken up together with them"—the living—"in the clouds to meet Christ, into the air" (1 Thess. iv. 16), is seen the earth moving in the endless infinity of space, in which the painter has laid the whole great drama. In faithful consistency with the vision of Ezechiel (xxxvii. 1-11) and with reminiscences of

¹ Thus V. VALENTIN in his book, *Über Künst, Künstler, und Kunstwerke* (Frankfort, 1889). See, on the other hand, JANITSCHKE in *Lit. Zentralblatt*, 1890, 192, and KALLAB in the article referred to *infra*, p. 627, n. 1.

Dante the resurrection of the flesh is accomplished on this little spot of earth. On the field full of bones there is murmuring and movement, bone draws near to bone and flesh and sinews cover them, the skin closes over them, and at last the Spirit also breathes through the great army which lives again.

The picture is one of shuddersome fidelity. The dead arise at the sound of the trumpets, lift the stones from their graves, shake off the dust from their bones and the sleep from their eyes, revive and slowly raise themselves to hear the irrevocable sentence. Single figures such as the skeleton, still hampered with the winding-sheet and staring into space from eyeless sockets, make an indelible impression.

But on the other side things yet more terrible are displayed. Not without a meaning is the range of clouds there represented as a fortress wall, not without a meaning do the martyrs there exhibit the instruments of their deaths with gestures of menace: for among the accursed whom the eternal Judge must shut out from heaven because they would not serve Him on earth are some who, like giants of the ancient mythology, would scale the regions of the blessed by force. A fearful battle is here engaged of which the issue cannot be doubtful. The eternal Judge has uttered His decree and its execution will be immediate. The angels separate the wicked from the good (Matt. xiii. 49) and hell can claim as prizes of victory those who have lived as servants of Satan and as such have died. One figure is filled with the consciousness of this and never has painter limned so horrible an image of despair. One of the damned close to the angelic trumpeters is snatched away by two grinning devils, a serpent is twined round him and bites him in the thigh. He does not defend himself. Gnawed to the core by the

feeling of his rejection, he stares blankly before him, half covering his face with one hand. *Lasciate ogni speranza!*

The rest who have perished through their mortal sins, struggle as they will, are cast off by angels or dragged down by devils and the leaden weight of guilt, just as on the opposite side the just move irresistibly heavenward. This contrast enhances the effect in the highest degree. In the host of the damned Michael Angelo's whole genius finds expression. These Titans in all the exuberance of flesh and blood, which shall offer a rich prey to their tormentors, suffer, as in Dante's *Inferno*, punishments congruous with their vices.

Underneath the headlong descent of the damned, Charon's boat unloads its burden on the strand of hell. The vessel is heavily freighted; but the passengers, wailing and cursing, are loath to disembark, so that the gruesome ferryman has to beat the reluctant with his oar and to tilt the wherry over with his foot in order to empty it of its cargo. Thus no other egress is left to the lost but the furnace of fire where are wailing and gnashing of teeth (Matt. viii. 12; xxii. 13). The inhabitants of hell, greedy of booty, their fires burning brightly, with grimaces of Satanic glee draw their victims to land with rakes. There in demoniac calm stands erect a naked man, his body embraced in the twofold coil of a serpent: this is the Minos of Dante's hell, who apportions to each soul the place appointed—and also a personage on the ecclesiastical stage well known to his contemporaries.¹

The obvious borrowings from Dante's immortal poem, in which Michael Angelo, in the lower right-hand quarter of his fresco, has stereotyped in a magnificent way some of the features of his own day, very soon excited attention.

¹ Cf. D'ANCONA, *Sacre Rappresent.*, III., 501, 520; KALLAB, p. 142, as cited *infra*, p. 627, n. 1.

But modern investigation has shown that in many other portions as well he has drawn upon the kindred genius of the great poet for his representations. Besides, a more general influence of Dante's creation on the imagination of the painter is worthy of remark: the descent of the lost into Hell corresponds in a certain degree to the *Inferno*, while the groups of the blessed rising on high to life eternal corresponds to the *Purgatorio*.¹ As further elements of inspiration, along with earlier pictures of the same subject, a foremost place of consideration must be given to Holy Scripture and the *Dies Irae*.²

In accordance with the serious tendency of Michael Angelo's genius is the one-sided, but, in view of the conditions of the time, perfectly intelligible conception of the Last Judgment as a wholly punitive manifestation.

¹ Cf. especially W. KALLAB'S treatise: Die Deutung von Michel Angelos Jüngstem Gericht, in the Beiträgen für Kunstgesch., dedicated to F. Wickhoff, Vienna, 1903, 138-153. I cannot mention this authoritative work of a scholar snatched too early from the pursuit of knowledge without expressing my thanks for the guidance afforded to me personally, on many of the points here under discussion, during his presence in Rome in 1901 (cf. also STEINMANN, II., 559 *seq.*; KRAUS-SAUER, II., 542 *seq.*; BORINSKI in Der Zeitschr. für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft, II., 2 [1907], and Die Rätsel Michelangelos, München, 1908). GRONER (Die christl. Kunst, 1907, 139) does not seem to know the treatise by Kallab, yet he asserts that the echoes of Dante are "apparently only isolated prettinesses *[sic!] in the great whole," and that the prophet Joel has inspired the whole composition.

² KRAUS-SAUER (II., 542, 543) is right in insisting on the influence of the *Dies Irae*; but together with this more consideration should be given to the influence of Holy Scripture, of which, according to Condivi, Michael Angelo was an earnest student, than is here the case. This was written before I had seen the work of THODE, who (V., 24 *seqq.*) brings out most forcibly the Biblical sources of inspiration, while at the same time restricting those attributable to Dante. See *ibid.*, 21 *seq.*, remarks on the earlier precursors of Michael Angelo.

While the author of this conception, the expression of which was intended to terrify a corrupt age into conversion and repentance, was leading up with all his powers to the contemplation of Christ and the saints, he brought a work into existence which, by the strangeness and novelty of its style, appeared quite erroneously to many to be the product of caprice and fancy. The final close of human history and the beatification of the just were not, as in the paintings of Fra Angelico, the themes that attracted Michael Angelo, but solely the reprobation of the lost. The words of terror, "Depart from me, ye cursed," dominate the whole picture. Everything is so powerfully and violently concentrated on this one motive of the Last Judgment that even the blessed quail with fear and the martyrs cry out for vengeance, not for their own sakes, but in order that the justice of God may be glorified. That this justice is equally manifested at the Last Day in the rewards of the just is consequently almost disregarded. The fresco, therefore, has been called by something of a misnomer. It would better be entitled, "The Condemnation of the Lost."

If it is taken into consideration that Michael Angelo, following the bent of his powerful and gloomy temperament, wished to depict this one side of his subject only, then one of the chief objections to his representation is already removed. Another, that he broke away from tradition, cannot also be admitted without modification. The references to Holy Scripture, to the *Dies Irae*, and to Dante show how little Michael Angelo intended to desert Catholic teaching, even if in its interpretation he went entirely on a way of his own. A modern investigator has come to the conclusion that in this gigantic picture no feature is to be found which is not in harmony with the canons of literary or artistic traditions, leaving out of the

question, naturally, the new expression of form.¹ This is correct; but the indiscriminate application of these expressions of form not only to the angels and saints, but to Christ the Lord, cannot altogether be brought into harmony with tradition. Theological tradition certainly might be appealed to in support of the nakedness of the saints, of those risen from the dead, and even for the scanty drapery of the Judge,² but the objectionable element is to be found much more in the portrayal of the figures—above all, in that of Christ, who is made to look half like a Hercules and half like an Apollo, and displays no stamp of super-human majesty.³ And in another respect also Michael Angelo has indulged in a remarkable deviation from conventional usage: in placing the picture on the altar wall, to which it does not properly belong, and where it is little in harmony with the Holy Sacrifice. A much better position would have been on the inner entrance wall, where it would have been seen by the faithful as they went out at the close of divine service, and have given

¹ Cf. KRAUS-SAUER, II., 541 *seq.*

² *Ibid.*, II., 544 *seq.*

³ Steinmann, who cites two early Italian painters for the almost entire nudity of the Judge, admits, however, that here the master broke entirely with ecclesiastical tradition in representing the Saviour of the world in the bloom of youth and untouched by sorrow. WOLTMANN (II., 588) describes the Christ of Michael Angelo as painted "in derision of all tradition" (cf. also KEPPLER, 265; MACKOWSKY, 237). The statement of P. Veronese (see *supra*, p. 619) that the Virgin Mary was also originally represented as an undraped figure was certainly rejected by SPRINGER (p. 427), but is now again reasserted (HAENDCKE in the *Kunstchronik*, XIV. [1903], 61; BERTEAUX, 105; RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 42; MACKOWSKY, 383). Mary, as a matter of fact, is represented in an attitude which without clothing would be meaningless; full of terror at the Judgment, she draws her vesture around her and gazes as through a veil at the forms of the saints soaring upwards. Only when clothed has the figure any meaning.

them food for reflection.¹ Had it been placed there, in accordance with a hitherto very general custom, many of the objections which even at the present still find expression would have been silenced.

Finally, as regards the nude figures, to which so much exception has been taken from the strongly religious point of view, it would seem that Michael Angelo intended by his thoroughgoing display of nakedness to symbolize the freedom from all earthly conditions of the soul,² which had to stand bare and without disguise before the judgment-seat of God. These herculean figures, with their knotted muscles and intense seriousness of countenance, are, besides, so conceived that they could not in any instance become to the beholder a source of sensual temptation. How far the painter with his undraped athletic figures has overstepped the limits which ought to be observed within the domain of the beautiful and of religious arts is a question on which probably there will always be a mixture of feelings and a diversity of opinions.³

¹ Cf. GRAUS in *Kirchenschmuck*, XXIV., 89. I cannot assent to the contrary opinion of KRAUS-SAUER (II., 547). The doctrinal tendency of the whole pictorial scheme of the Sixtine, which is here very appropriately insisted on, is directly in favour of the entrance wall. It is impossible, indeed, to say definitely how far Michael Angelo had a free choice in the matter one way or the other.

² MACKOWSKY, 241.

³ Sauer, whose appreciation of the Last Judgment (KRAUS, II., 545 *seq.*) is as warm as it is thorough, touches the opposite extreme from the hostile critics of the 18th century (see THODE, V., 70 *seq.*) and the Romantics (*cf.* Montalembert and Lévêque's opinion, given by SORTAIS, in the *Etudes*, LXXXV. [1900], 320 *seq.*, and the immoderate invective of KREUSER in the *Organ für christliche Kunst*, 1871, 79) and declares Keppler's opinion to be too severe. The latter therefore has, in the new edition of his admirable treatise, mitigated his censures in certain points; nevertheless he produces an array of serious objections (*op. cit.*, p. 263 *seq.*). Cf. besides MACKOWSKY, 242 *seq.* F.

The Last Judgment was hardly finished when, in the middle of November 1541, Paul III. commissioned Michael Angelo to undertake a second great task.¹ This time he was not called upon to enlarge the dwelling of the Farnesi but to decorate the palace of the Popes.² Close to the Sistine Chapel, separated from it only by the Sala Regia, Paul III. had built a new chapel from plans by Sangallo,³ the vaulted ceiling of which had been ornamented in stucco by Raphael's pupil Perino del Vaga.⁴ The

RIEFFEL (Katholik, 1909, I., 387) insists, in a review of Sauer's work, with reference to the judgment there past upon the fresco: "It will always be difficult to turn away from this picture with unmixed feelings. It is impossible to fill up the gap between the profoundly Christian and ethical substance of the picture and the alien types in which it has been expressed and to reconcile the idea of Christ and the saints with its incorporation in the frames of antique gods and Titans. . . . To us who cannot see with Michelangelo's eyes or feel with the emotions of his soul, the picture disturbs us much more than it shocks, and therefore Kepler's verdict hardly seems too strong."

¹ Cf. GAYE, II., 289, 290, and in Appendix No. 9 *Sernini's letter of Dec. 19, 1541 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

² MACKOWSKY, 244.

³ See VASARI, V., 466; CLAUSSE (Sangallo, II., 366) dates the building "vers. 1540." The exact date is given by the *Diary of Blasius de Martinellis, who reported on Jan. 25, 1540: "Papa reversus Romam ex provincia patrimonii fecit celebrare missam in capella sua noviter erecta in palatio, quam dedicavit in invocatione b. Pauli." Paul III. attended this Mass in person. On March 10, 1540, Blasius de Martinellis speaks of the "capella Pauli in palatio" (Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 55).

⁴ *1542, Agosto 27: "Scuta 100 auri in auro . . . mag. Perino pictori palatino circa incrustationes cementarias di stucco vulgo nuncupatus in capella palatii apostolici laboranti" (Mand., 1540-1543, State Archives, Rome). While Michael Angelo was painting the walls of the Cappella Paolina work was still continuing on the decoration of the sanctuary. *1542, Settemb. 24: "M^{ro} Girolamo falegniam detto il Bologna de dare . . . scudi 10 hauti da m. Giacomo Meleghino

walls of this chapel, dedicated to St. Paul and known as the Cappella Paolina, were to be adorned with frescoes by Michael Angelo. The latter undertook the task unwillingly; the painting of fresco, he complained, was a toilsome undertaking for an old man of sixty-seven; moreover, his obligations connected with the monument of Julius II. pressed heavily upon him. Duke Guidobaldo had indeed given him a respite for such a period only as the work on the Last Judgment lasted in the full expectation that, when the latter was finished, he would devote himself without delay to the completion of the mausoleum on which his labours had been interrupted so often. After Paul III. had removed this difficulty also¹ Michael Angelo bent himself to this new burden for the sake of a Pope to whom, as he himself declared, he could refuse nothing.²

The Pope certainly had a share in the choice of subjects

per mano di Benvenuto Olivieri et questi a bon conto di tellari di noce chel fa per li dua finestroni di vetro della capella nova di palazzo". (Edif. publ., 1542, 1543; cf. BERTOLOTTI, Speserie, 184). *1544, Nov. 15: "A m. Nicolo Francese vetraro scudi 7 per sue fatiche et spesa di stagno et fillo di rame posti a rifare li 4 pezzi di vetriate ritornate alli finestroni della capella nova di palazzo, dove hora depinge m Michelangelo" (Edif. publ., 1544 al 1549). On Oct. 4, 1544, there are entries for Pietro Sancta and Jacomo scultori of "sc. 50" for the "ombrella di marmor posta ne la volta de li stucchi verso la capella Paulina" (BERTOLOTTI, *loc. cit.*, 189). About 1545 a bronze tabernacle was begun for the chapel (*ibid.*, 188-190); 1546 the arms over the doors of the chapel were paid for (*ibid.*, 189). The marble doors ("janua marbi mixti") were not finished until 1549 (*Mand., 1549-1550, State Archives, Rome). Scipione Gabrielli *reported on Nov. 29, 1549, that there had been an assembly of Cardinals "in una cappella nuova fatta de la f. m. di P. Paulo chiamata la cappella di Paulo *non ancora finita*" (State Archives of Siena).

¹ Cf. FREY, Briefe, 345 *seq.*; GAYE, II., 297 *seq.*; GUHL, I., 135 *seq.*; JUSTI, 323 *seq.*; THODE, I., 436 *seq.*

² Lett. di Michelangelo, ed. MILANESI, 490; GUHL, I., 142.

for the frescoes in the Cappella Paolina. The glorification of the two princes of the Apostles who had sanctified Rome with their blood was in full accord with the associations of a house of worship destined to be the private chapel of the Papal Palace. It is remarkable that the companion picture to the crucifixion of St. Peter should be not the beheading of St. Paul but his conversion. That a scene from St. Paul's life should be chosen arose certainly from the fact that he was the patronal saint of the Farnese Pope. That the conversion rather than the martyrdom was chosen can be explained from the Pope's annual custom of keeping that feast, the 25th of January, with great solemnity in S. Paolo fuori le mura.¹ It is more probable, however, that the painter, on artistic grounds, avoided a duplicate representation of martyrdom with its necessary similarity of grouping and treatment.

Paul III. took the greatest interest in the frescoes. As early as the 12th of July 1545 he made an inspection of the work.² On the 13th of October 1549 the veteran of eighty-two mounted the ladder to the platform in order to examine minutely the details of the paintings.³ Unfortunately, a fire, the effects of time and later restorations have done great injury to both these rich compositions. The lighting is also so unfavourable that without the assistance of copper plates it is impossible to become acquainted with

¹ In the years 1535, 1536, and 1537 Paul III. always visited S. Paolo fuori le mura on Jan. 25 (see Blasius de Martinellis, *Diarium, Secret Archives of the Vatican, XII., 56). The same relates that the Pope wished to do this in 1539, "pro voto seu devotione sua," but was prevented by bad weather. In 1540 the feast was celebrated in the Cappella Paolina (see *supra*, p. 631, n. 3).

² See Firmanus, *Diaria caer.*, published by POGATSCHER in *Repert. für Kunstwissensch.*, XXIX., 399.

³ See Serristori's letter of Oct. 13, 1549, given by GRONAU, *ibid.*, XXX. 194.

the details. This last work from Michael Angelo's brush, begun at the end of 1542 and finished in 1549 or 1550,¹ foretells by its unrestrained movement and flight of imagination the approach of the baroque. Dramatic force, delight in athletic bodily forms in every posture of violent exertion, here bear witness, as in other works, to the characteristic of the master, who alone could treat as child's play the delineation of the most difficult positions and boldest foreshortenings.²

While Michael Angelo was still engaged on the frescoes of the Cappella Paolina, the monument of Julius II. was brought at last to an indifferent termination. It was erected, not in the new St. Peter's as intended, but on the wall of the right transept of S. Pietro ad Vincula, the former Pope's cardinalitial church and none too large an edifice. This took place in May 1545. Instead of the forty statues planned by Michael Angelo it displays only three from his hand. Among them indeed is the Moses, certainly one of the most consummate specimens of the sculptor's handicraft. So overpowering is the effect of this marvellous creation that a peculiar feature of the monument is easily overlooked: it was originally intended to use the modernized heathen symbols of victory, and to introduce two figures of captives. This design was abandoned, as Michael Angelo, on whom the strictures pronounced on the nude figures of the Last Judgment had not been wholly thrown away, no longer considered it suitable for a church. In the place of

¹ See the extracts from the accounts given by KALLAB in the *Kunstgeschichtlichen Anzeigen*, I. (1904), 11 n., where, however, it is overlooked that these entries were already published by FANFANI in 1876 (*Spigolatura Michelangiolesca*, 123 *seq.*) and BERTELOTTI (*Speserie*, 184, 195, 198, 200). Cf. also THODE, V., 77 *seq.*

² See SPRINGER, 432 *seq.*; BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, II., 4th ed., 646; WEY, *Rome*, 646; HARNACK, *Rom.*, II.: *Neuere Kunst*, 48 *seq.*; KRAUS-SAUER, II., 552 *seq.*; MACKOWSKY, 245 *seq.*

the captives were substituted religious statues: Leah and Rachel as types of the active and contemplative life. Both these tranquil, gentle forms, as well as the statues executed by the assistant sculptors, are tempered by Christian feeling. The Madonna with the Infant Jesus, surmounting the sarcophagus with the recumbent figure of the Pope, embodies deep religious sentiment. In a word, the mausoleum, designed and begun in a totally different spirit, has been remoulded in a Christian and ecclesiastical spirit.¹ It reveals the powerful Catholic reaction which, under the influence of Vittoria Colonna and the revival of ecclesiastical feeling, had begun to tell increasingly on Michael Angelo. This reaction reached its climax in the undertaking of his last great work, the final stage of his unequalled career as an artist, the rebuilding of St. Peter's.

During the last days of Clement VII. this work was completely at a standstill. Grass and undergrowth was rank on the lofty arches of Bramante.² Paul III., shocked at such a state of things,³ immediately after his election took into consideration the resumption of the works, over which Antonio da Sangallo and Baldassare Peruzzi were appointed.⁴

In order to raise the necessary funds Paul III. had

¹ The above follows JUSTI (Michelangelo, 339-346). For the statue of Moses see above, Vol. VI. of this work, 537 *seq.*

² See the contemporary reproduction in GEYMÜLLER, Ursprüngliche Entwürfe, Tafel 49, No. 2.

³ See in Appendix No. 3 the *brief to Francis I., dat. Sept. 7, 1536 (Secret Archives of the Vatican); *cf. infra*, p. 637, n. 1.

⁴ See *supra*, p. 553 *seq.* *Baldassar da Siena, architetto della fabrica di S. Pietro riceve da Bindo Altoviti depositario della medesima a 18 Marzo d. 30 e 25 e 100 e 89 e finalmente 194 per soldo e questa ultima partita si pagò a Giov. Silverio e fratelli figli di detto Baldassar atteso che egli morì a 6 Gennaio 1536 et haveva a ragione di 25 d. il mese. Cod. H-II., 22, f. 2, of the Chigi Library, Rome.

recourse to the same methods as his predecessor. In a Bull of the 16th of September 1535, graces and indulgences were offered to all supporters of the work.¹ A special confraternity of St. Peter was founded, of which the Pope and Cardinals were members. The most eminent princes were requested to give admission to and to propagate the new association in their countries. Francis I.² was appealed to on the 7th of September 1536, and the Emperor on the 20th of November of the same year.³ The money for the *Fabbrica* or building fund was deposited with the banking-house of Bindo Altoviti.⁴

The commissioners of the fabric of St. Peter's, whose privileges were confirmed by Paul III. by a special Bull and protected under threat of penalties,⁵ were encouraged in their labours by the Pope to the utmost of his ability,⁶

¹ **Min. brev. Arm., 40, t. 50, n. 179 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See in Appendix No. 3 the *brief of Sept. 7, 1536.

³ See the *briefs to Charles V. and to Covos, both of Nov. 20, 1536. Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 4, n. 89 and 107 (Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Cod. H-II., 22, f. 3, of the Chigi Library, Rome; *cf. ibid.*, f. 7: *De expensis ante 1529 nulla ratio reperitur, ab ipso vero a. 1529, a quo d. Altoviti munus depositariorum assumpserunt usque ad a. 1540 expendit. fuerunt d. 17,620.

⁵ *Cf.* Compendio di teorica e di pratica d. rev. Fabbrica di S. Pietro, Roma, 1793, 4, 14, 32, 44, 48, 50.

⁶ *Cf.* *the letter intended for Sicily of Feb. 18, 1537, with special application to the clergy (Arm., 41, t. 5, n. 108). *Ibid.*, t. 17, n. 350, the *brief to the King of Poland, dated April 28, 1540, the preamble of which runs thus: "Cum inchoatum alias per fe. re. Julium secundum predecessorem nostrum eximiam fabricam basilice principis apostolorum de Urbe sie urgentibus temporum necessitatibus reliqui predecessores nostri post eum *aliquantis per intermisserint* unde ipsum templum, quod ceteris splendori et exemplo esse debuerat, hactenus neque prioris templi a magno Constantino extracti splendorem habuit neque ad reformationem destinatam ob temporum difficultates reduci potuit," etc. (Secret Archives of the Vatican). See also G. M. della Porta's *report, dat. Aug. 10, 1539 (State Archives, Florence, Urb.).

but the conditions of the time were in the highest degree unfavourable for the reception of exhortations to support this great work.¹ Together with the renewal of the war between the Emperor and King Francis the menacing attitude of the Turk was prejudicial. In August 1537 the Pope found himself compelled, in presence of this permanent source of danger, to give up all sums of money, coming from Spain to the building fund in return for indulgences and graces, to the Emperor, who had need of them for the protection of Christendom against the infidel.² As the expenses for the fortification of Rome and for the Turkish war had exhausted the resources of the Apostolic Chamber, an attempt was made to cover the deficit by the distribution of fresh indulgences.³ To the application of a portion of the Spanish *crusada* money to the fabric of St. Peter's, Charles V. in 1539 raised difficulties.⁴ In 1544 he claimed a portion of the sums raised in Spain, and the Pope referred the question to the deputies of the *Fabbrica*.⁵ The King

¹ In a *brief to Francis I., dat. Jan. 16, 1537, Paul III. remarks that he had already written to the King that the great work of building the Basilica had been interrupted "non absque universali scandalo et predecessorum nostrorum imputatione et rei christ. dedecore"; he felt compelled to finish the work, and begged the King to show favour to the measures he had adopted (Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 5, n. 107; cf. *ibid.*, n. 48, the *brief to the Cancell. Franciae of the same day. Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² See the *brief to the Card. Seguntinus [Garzia Loaysa] of Aug. 25, 1537 (copy in the State Archives, Florence, MS. Torrig.); cf. the *briefs to the same of Nov. 29, 1538 (Arm., 41, t. 11, n. 1056), and Feb. 4, 1541 (*ibid.*, t. 20, n. 104, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

³ Cf. the *brief to Francis I., dat. Oct. 23, 1537 (Arm., 41, t. 8, n. 130, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

⁴ Cf. FEA, Notizie, 36.

⁵ Cf. Cardinal Farnese's *letter to Poggio of Feb. 25, 1544 (Chigi Library, Rome, L-III., 65, f. 296).

of Portugal at the same time made similar demands.¹ Nevertheless, the receipts were considerable, especially the proceeds of indulgences, for which commissioners were despatched to the most different countries,² even to the Netherlands, penetrated as they were with Lutheran teaching. After the reform of the Penitentiaria, a general limitation of these indulgences was carried out, as they had given rise to many abuses.³

In accordance with the Pope's wishes, a greater building activity began in 1539, at which time also the staff of commissioners was renewed.⁴ From 1540 to the end of 1546 no less than 162,624 ducats were paid out on the construction.⁵ In February 1544, during the works in the chapel of S. Petronilla, the sarcophagus containing the remains of the first wife of the Emperor Honorius, Maria the daughter of Stilicho, was discovered. Most of the precious things buried with the body of the youthful Empress were unfortunately scattered, and some of the jewels were used in the ornamentation of a new tiara.⁶ In the

¹ *On July 20, 1544, the Portuguese nuncio was enjoined to proclaim in Portugal the full powers of the Fabbrica S. Petri, and to hand over a portion of the proceeds of the same to the King in support of his naval expedition against the infidels (Arm., 41, t. 30, n. 480, 481, Secret Archives of the Vatican).

² Nuntiaturberichte, V., 125, 148.

³ Cf. DRUFFEL-BRANDI, 456, and also the "Bulla Innovat. aliar. sup. quaest. prohib. et indugent. suspens. nisi de consensu deputat. fabr. S. Petri et certis tantum temporibus, dat. 1546 IV. non. April"; copy of the same date in the Casanatense Library, Rome.

⁴ See the report of De Plotis of July 14, 1539, in SOLMI, Ochino, 55.

⁵ FEA, Notizie, 32, 33.

⁶ Cf. MARLIANUS, Romae Topographia, Romae, 1550, 154 *seq.*; CANCELLIERI, De secret. bas. S. Petri, 995 *seq.*, 1032 *seq.*; DE ROSSI in Bullett. d. Archeol. Crist., 1863, 53 *seq.*; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, Œuvres, II., 348 *seq.*; MÜNTZ, La tiare, 89.

spring of 1544 the rebuilding was making rapid progress.¹ At that time great quantities of pinewood were brought from the woods of Camaldoli.² For the easier carriage of building materials, especially of travertine, Paul III. in 1538 bestowed on the fabric of St. Peter's the riparian rights of the river Anio, from the Ponte Lucano to its junction with the Tiber, in order that the navigation might be restored to the condition it was in under Julius II., and made use of accordingly.³

Sangallo, who, as chief architect, had superintended the works alone since 1537,⁴ drew out an entirely new plan, from which his pupil Antonio Labacco began⁵ to construct a large wooden model in 1539. It cost more than 5000 ducats, and is at present preserved in the octagon room over the Clementine chapel known as the Octagon of S. Gregorio.⁶

Although Sangallo's plan presents many beauties in

¹ See Cardinal Farnese's letter of Feb. 25, 1544, cited *supra*, p. 637, n. 5.

² See N. Serristori's *report, dat. Feb. 12, 1544, in State Archives, Florence.

³ **Motu proprio, dat. [1538] X Cal. Sept. A° 5o. Secret Archives of the Vatican. See in Appendix No. 6.

⁴ He received 25 ducats monthly; see: *Libro d' entrata et uscita 1543-1549, f. 88, in the Archives of the Fabbrica of St. Peter's; cf *Cod. H-II., 22, f. 44, of the Chigi Library, Rome: "Alla rev. fabrica a di 27 Sett. 1546 duc. 25 m^{ta} pagati per mandato a m. Ant. da S. Gallo per sua provisione di Settembre. Alla detta adì 18 Ottobre 1546 duc. 203. 60 m^{ta} agli credi di m. Ant. S. Gallo per resto di rubbia 759 di calce."

⁵ This date is obtained from the *accounts in the Archives of the Fabbrica of St. Peter's, from which Geymüller intends to give fuller extracts.

⁶ See VASARI, V., 468; BONANNI, Tav., 14-16, pp. 56-58; JOVANO-VITS, 89 *seq.*, 94; CLAUSSE, Sangallo, II., 128 *seq.*; LETAROUILLY-SIMIL, Vatican, I., 17 *seqq.*; Zeitschr. für bild. Kunst, IX., 314; X., 251; XIII., 126, 128.

detail, such as the double tier in the drum of the cupola, yet as a whole it lies open to many objections. The somewhat pedantic repetition of certain features bestows on it a monotonous character. The great cupola, the vault of which rises on two tiers of arcades, gives an impression of heaviness. The huge vestibule, with which the church would have attained nearly the length of the present Basilica, was intended on the one hand to preserve the shape of the Greek cross and on the other to bring under cover the entire space occupied by old St. Peter's. The form of this vestibule would, however, have impaired many parts of the Vatican Palace. Michael Angelo was of opinion that the Cappella Paolina and other portions of the Vatican would have been destroyed and that even the Sistine would not have escaped; this latter inference certainly was not altogether conclusive.¹ He was quite correct, however, in detecting a not less serious defect in Sangallo's transformation of Bramante's entrance to the choir. The latter, he points out, in his unsparing criticism of Sangallo's model, would not only deprive Bramante's design of all light, but would bring with it yet other inconveniences. In the recesses above and beneath the choir bad characters could hide themselves and coin false money, so that at night, after the church was closed, at least five-and-twenty men would be required to search whether any one were concealed within, a quest which it would be no easy matter to carry out.²

¹ Baron von Geymüller had the kindness to examine into this question thoroughly, at my request. He calculated the distance between the St. Peter's of Sangallo and the Sistine Chapel at any given spot would be from 10 to 12 metres.

² Lett. di Michelangelo, ed. MILANESI, 535; GUHL, Künstlerbriefe, I., 160 *seq.* The undated letter belongs not, as THODE (I., 87) supposes, to the year 1555, but certainly to the last months of 1546 (see MACKOWSKY, 390).

A fatal misconception of Sangallo's was the elevation, for reasons not explained, of the level of the church to a height of more than three metres, whereby the niches and semicircular chapels placed by Bramante in the pillars of the cupola and in the upper part of the building obtained a width disproportionate to their height. Besides these expensive and lengthy operations he ordered the forearm of the cross and the equally long left transept to be raised higher and both vaulted over.¹ In August 1538 a partition wall had already been erected to cut off the still remaining portion of the original nave.² The condition of the building in the autumn of 1546 is shown in the fresco in the Cancelleria.³

After Sangallo's decease about this time negotiations were at once begun with Giulio Romano with a view to his succession to the superintendency. They came, however, to nothing owing to Romano's death on the 1st of November 1546.⁴ Naturally attention was now fixed on Michael Angelo. As he was now seventy-two years of age and had had a severe⁵ illness in the summer of 1544 and again at the end of 1545, he did not meet the fresh task with joy. To the enfeebling effects of old age there was added the certainty that he would be hindered at every step by jealous and envious workpeople and by pedantic and self-opinionated commissioners—and then, lastly, the difficulties of the undertaking itself! Before his vision passed the

¹ Cf. GEYMÜLLER, *Ursprüngl. Entwürfe*, 338; BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, II., 5th ed., 219. It would be of importance to establish the date of the raising of the pavement; all the sources at present known to us are at variance on this point.

² Cf. GEYMÜLLER, *loc. cit.*, 327; *N. Arch. Veneto*, XIII. (1907), 23.

³ Cf. *supra*, p. 606, and JOVANOVIĆ, 95.

⁴ "Mihi relatum fuit de obitu Julii Romani pictoris excellentissimi," says the *Ephem. in the Cod. Vat., 6978, f. 154, of the Vatican Library.

⁵ Cf. THODE, *Michelangelo*, I., 440, 443; FREY, 348.

architects who for forty years before him had attempted the enterprise: Bramante, Giuliano da Sangallo, Fra Giocondo, Raphael, Peruzzi, Antonio da Sangallo. The successors of Bramante, with their partially contradictory plans, had introduced a confusion into the conception of the building which can hardly be exaggerated. To find the right way through seemed a task of extraordinary difficulty.

Paul III. was convinced that the practical genius of Michael Angelo alone could advance the work rapidly and profitably. To the entreaties of his patron Michael Angelo yielded at last, but he made his own conditions. They were in the highest degree characteristic of the man and of his Catholic feeling: he refused all salary. On purely religious grounds, for the love of God and veneration for the Prince of the Apostles, he undertook the vast undertaking for the good of his soul, just as he had also promised to plan a church for St. Ignatius of Loyola in the same ideal sense. But, foreseeing the difficulties that lay before him, he sought from the Pope, in the interest of the great work, full powers and freedom to work and create as his own genius directed him. Paul III. generously conceded all he desired, and gave him authority to alter at his pleasure the model, shape, and construction, and to dismiss or replace the workmen and supervisors of the building. Relying on his absolute disinterestedness, he absolved the master from all rendering of and responsibility for accounts. The latter thereupon, at the beginning of 1547, set himself to work on the rebuilding of St. Peter's.¹

The unrestricted powers bestowed upon Michael Angelo by Paul III. caused his fellow-craftsmen, envious of the

¹ See VASARI, VII., 218 *seq.*; JUSTI, 347; MACKOWSKY, 279, and specially POGATSCHER in *Repert. für Kunstwissensch.*, XXIX. (1906), 403.

distinctions heaped upon him from year to year by the chief ruler of the Church, to blaze up in an outburst of jealousy. The irritable nature of the man and his inexorable uprightness made the tension sharper. The greatest resentment was felt by the numerous partisans of Sangallo, who were named by Vasari the "Setta Sangallesca" or "Sangallesque faction." They gave open vent to their bitterness one day when Michael Angelo appeared at the building works. To the scornful remark that they were glad that he had consented to assume the directorship, since Sangallo's plan would be a rich meadow for him to find pasture in, he curtly replied, "You say well." His meaning, however, was not perceived. Michael Angelo told another that what he intended to convey was, Sangallo's adherents were quite right in describing his plan as a meadow, for they expressed their opinions like oxen.¹

Michael Angelo's contempt for these attacks is shown in his treatment of Nanni di Baccio Bigio. The latter had spread reports which were downright calumnies: Michael Angelo knew nothing of architecture and wasted money; his model was a crazy and puerile affair; he only worked at night in order to prevent his plans from being seen; he himself, Nanni, however, would construct a fresh model, and, besides, enjoyed the full confidence of the Pope. In order to make his assertions more credible, he also gave currency to the report that the wooden model for the Farnese palace was so heavy that when it was set up on approval the palace had to be propped up. As this tittle-tattle came to the ears even of the deputies of the *Fabbrica* and was listened to, Michael Angelo communicated to one of them the letter of Giovanni Francesco Ughi of May the 14th, 1547, by which he was made acquainted with the above intrigues, and added that

¹ VASARI, VII., 218.

nothing else could be expected from such a set of common rascals.¹ To all appearance this silenced his calumniators for a time, and Michael Angelo, with the Pope's unre-served confidence, was able to devote himself in peace to his great work. Yet it was unfortunate for himself and useful to his numerous enemies that his appointment as director of the building works, and the full powers thereto belonging, had proceeded only orally from the Pope. In order to put an end to all uncertainty and all hostile behaviour, the Pope on the 11th of October 1549 issued a *motu proprio* to the following effect: All that Michael Angelo, at the Pope's command, had done hitherto on the building of St. Peter's, in accordance with his own model, was approved; this model was for all time to be strictly adhered to, and Michael Angelo to continue, during life, to be the architect of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles.²

How entirely Paul III. was justified in giving the master plenary powers was shown by the immense impetus given to the work of construction on St. Peter's, from the beginning of 1547 onwards. It was soon possible to predict that the new Basilica would surpass all other churches and rank as one of the wonders of the world.³ The yearly expenditure amounted to upwards of 30,000 ducats.⁴ That

¹ GOTTI, I., 309.

² First correctly published, and with date, by POGATSCHER in *Repert. für Kunstwissensch.*, XXIX. (1906), 400 *seq.*

³ "In hujus vero ipsius, in qua hodierno die funebris haec pompa ducitur, basilicae exaedificationem tanta cura incubuit, ut ea jam prope ad fastigium perducta substructionum magnificentia, cum sacris omnibus hujus aetatis aedibus antecellat, una cum septem illis, quae olim miraculo toti orbi terrarum fuerunt, operibus comparari posse videatur" (AMASAEUS, 75).

⁴ From Jan. 1, 1547, to May 8, 1551, 121,554 ducats were paid out (see FEA, *Notizie*, 35).

it was Paul III. alone to whom this reaction was due can be proved from the lethargy which fell upon the works after his death. Justly did Michael Angelo deplore the loss of his best personal supporter when he uttered the testimony in his honour: "He never showed me anything but kindness, and I had the right to hope that he would show yet more in days to come."¹

Paul III. had given him a free hand in artistic as well as administrative affairs. The rejection of Sangallo's plan and the substitution of the new model had been fully approved. Of the freedom guaranteed to him Michael Angelo made the fullest use. At the beginning he called himself modestly only the accomplisher of Bramante's plans; this referred principally to the retention of the Greek cross formation and the essential points of the interior design as a whole;² as regards all the rest, however, Michael Angelo went his own way. Although in his severe criticism of Sangallo he had maintained that to depart from the arrangement of Bramante was to deviate from truth,³ he himself did not avoid the same error, and stamped on many portions of the new building the impress of his own restless genius, ever in search of new effects, whereby the marvellous harmony which distinguished Bramante's plan could not but be impaired.

¹ See Lett. di Michelangelo, ed. MILANESI, 260.

² For what follows, *cf.* GEYMÜLLER, the first authority on such matters, in the fifth edition (1884) of BURCKHARDT'S *Cicerone* (II., 219 *seq.*), and also his well-known work, "Michelangelo als Architekt" (p. 38 *seq.*). The relation of Michael Angelo's plan to that of Bramante is illustrated by the coloured sketch of the historical development of St. Peter's in GEYMÜLLER, *Ursprüngl. Entwürfe*, Tafel 45. For Michael Angelo's innovations on Bramante's plan of St. Peter's, see also RIEGL, *Barockkunst*, 84 *seq.*, and MACKOWSKY, 331 *seq.*

³ Lett. di Michelangelo, ed. MILANESI, 535.

A model, finished within fourteen days, at a cost of only fifty scudi, gave Paul III. an idea of the new plan. While Michael Angelo retained the central dome, the great quadrate surrounding it, the arms of the cross, equal in length and terminated by apses, as given in the matchless design of Bramante, he resolved to give up his galleries, his lateral porches, and the great corner towers which still appeared in Sangallo's plan, although with important alterations. It is probable that this narrowing of the space around the dome, to the advantage of the dominating centre, was also conditioned by financial circumstances, for it was by such a material simplification only that the completion of the building could have been looked for within a calculable distance of time.

A fresco in the Vatican Library¹ shows the porch adorned with ten huge columns. In front of it, in the middle, is a gable supported by four equally massive pillars, the whole of this being in complete subordination to the central dome, the colossal size of which is thrown into high relief by four smaller domes rising from the angles of the arms of the cross. Outside, at those places in the great quadrate where, according to Bramante and Sangallo, the galleries were to begin, Michael Angelo made use of slanting truncated walls to connect the apses with the quadrate. As the effect of this, in combination with the attic and its cumbersome arrangement of massive pilasters, is far from beautiful, so in the interior the apsidal architecture is throughout infelicitous in conception. The baroque windows and the semi-cupolas, which fit in somewhat inharmoniously with the vaulting, have been severely objected to by an eminent architectural critic, but can, at the same time, be explained from the difficulties of Michael Angelo's mission as an impetuous seeker after new forms

¹ See LETAROUILLY-SIMIL, I., 23 *seq.*

and processes of art, with all the dangers attendant upon one who ventures on those thorny heights.¹

As the creator of the dome of St. Peter's Michael Angelo produced an incomparable work. Without and within the composition of the whole has been marvellously conceived. Classical beauty is everywhere apparent in its noblest and purest form, with monumental proportions, logical articulation, and certainty of execution. Even the keenest critics admit that seldom or never has the principle of ascending continuity of construction, borrowed from the Gothic style, been expressed on antique lines more beautifully than here, with equal success in the interior from the base of the drum to the aperture of the lantern, and on the exterior from the cupola to the foot of the cross.²

In consequence of the abandonment of Bramante's towers Michael Angelo found himself obliged to carry the exterior line of the dome somewhat higher than his great predecessor had intended in his plan. Bramante had laid the chief weight of the dome on the magnificent circle of stuated pillars to be carried round the drum, Michael Angelo transferred the incidence of the weight to the heightened line of the dome itself. This accentuation of the vaulting deepens the impression of majestic repose. From without the dome certainly presents the most

¹ GEYMÜLLER (Michelangelo als Architekt, 38 *seq.*) remarks: "If we think of the monumental dignity and enchanting arrangement of light, in wonderful harmony with the effect of the central dome, which Bramante had designed for the termination of his great edifice, the eye is deeply offended by the lack of co-ordination in Michael Angelo's scheme and the ultra-profanity of the windows . . . forms of composition which, despite Michael Angelo's assertions, cannot be brought into unison with the 'ragione' of the Church, or the structural law of the building." See also BURCKHARDT-HOLTZINGER 128, and BERTEAUX, Rome, 112.

² GEYMÜLLER, *loc. cit.*, 39.

beautiful and most elevated contour which has ever yet been reached in the domain of architecture.¹

Even if the details of this crown, which is suspended in beauty and majesty over the grave of St. Peter, were not settled until later, on the construction of an accurate model, yet the ground design of the whole was firmly grasped by the spiritual eye of Michael Angelo while Paul III. was yet alive.

To that sagacious Pontiff, who dealt so tactfully with the sensitive artist and knew how to enlist his genius for the highest services, an important share must be allotted in the construction of the imperial dome of St. Peter's.

With this great work of Michael Angelo, Rome the eternal received her finest adornment, and a peerless symbol of that supreme spiritual authority transmitted by Christ to the Apostle Peter and his successors.

¹ Geymüller in BURCKHARDT, Cicerone, II., 5th ed., 220. The view, supported by Letarouilly, Garnier, Simil, and others, that the present external line of the dome is due, not to Michael Angelo, but to Giacomo della Porta, is incorrect (see GEYMÜLLER, Ursprüngl. Entwürfe, 244). For the relation to the Gothic style, *cf.* JUSTI, Michelangelo, 347; RIEGL, Barockkunst, 86, 87.

APPENDIX
OF
UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS
AND
EXTRACTS FROM ARCHIVES.

APPENDIX.

I. POPE PAUL III. TO BALDASSARE PERUZZI.¹

1534, December 1, Rom.

Dilecto filio magistro Baltassari Perutio Senensi. Dilecte fili salutem etc. Cum, sicut accepimus, alias fel. rec. Leo X primo et deinde sanctae memoriae Clemens VII Romani pontifices praedecessores nostri te architectum fabricae basilicae s^{ci} Petri de Urbe cum salario annuo CL ducatorum auri de camera tibi de pecuniis dictae fabricae singulis mensibus pro rata persolvendo ad vitam tuam deputaverint, prout in eorum literis plenius continetur, Nos non minoris virtutem et ingenium tuum aestimantes, quam dicti praedecessores aestimaverint, operaque tua in dictae basilicae fabrica uti intendentes teque majori praemio dignum esse censes, te fabricae predictae architectum cum salario annuo non CL sed CCC ducatorum similium ad vitam tuam confirmamus per praesentes mandantes dilectis filiis praefectis dictae fabricae nunc et pro tempore existentibus, ut de pecuniis dictae fabricae dictum salarium trecentorum ducatorum singulis mensibus pro rata videlicet ducatos XXV auri similes in fine cujuslibet mensis a data praesentium incohando tibi, quoad vixeris, persolvant seu per illarum depositarium persolvi faciant et mandent. Nos enim, quidquid illi tibi pro dicto salario persolverint, ut praefertur, ratum habebimus et in eorum computis admitti faciemus ac ex nunc admittimus contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae etc. prima decembris 1534 anno primo.

Blos[ius].

Papa mandavit ut expediretur

A. thesaurarius.

[Concept. Min. brev. Arm. 40, t. 49, n. 45. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 554.

2. POPE PAUL III. TO ANTONIO DA SANGALLO.¹

1536, Mai 28, Rom.

Dilecto filio Antonio de Sancto Gallo, laico Florentino, architecto nostro. Dilecte fili salutem etc. Cum sicut accepimus alias fel. rec. Leo X te architectum principalem fabricae basilicae principis apostolorum de Urbe ad vitam tuam cum salario menstruo viginti quinque scutorum auri et pie me. Clemens VII Romani pontifices predecessores nostri te similiter principalem architectum fabricae arcis nostrae civitatis Anconae cum simili salario ac fabricae beatae Mariae de Loreto cum salario itidem menstruo decem scutorum similium deputaverint, prout in eorum literis plenius continetur: Nos virtutem et ingenium tuum non minoris facientes quam ipsi predecessores fecerint, illisque tam in predictis quam in quibusvis aliis fabricis per nos in toto statu nostro ecclesiastico designandis uti intendentes, te architectum principalem fabricae dictae basilicae cum dicto salario menstruo viginti quinque scutorum tibi per eiusdem fabricae prefectos et ex dictae fabricae pecuniis persolvendo ad vitam tuam, ut prefertur, fabricae autem arcis Anconae et beatae Marie de Loreto et quarumvis aliarum fabricarum status nostri ecclesiastici cum salario menstruo triginta quinque scutorum similium, ex quibus viginti quinque quidem thesaurarius dictae civitatis Anconae, reliquos vero decem gubernator ecclesiae eiusdem beate Mariae de Loreto singulis mensibus tibi solvere teneantur, ad nostrum beneplacitum confirmamus et de novo deputamus per presentes mandantes prefectis, thesaurario et gubernatori predictis, ut dictum salarium tibi iuxta presentium litterarum nostrarum tenorem persolvant contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae 28 maii 1536 anno 2°.

A. thesaur.
Blos.[Concept. Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 2, n. 12. Secret Archives
of the Vatican.]¹ See *supra*, p. 554.

3. POPE PAUL III. TO FRANCIS I., KING OF FRANCE.¹

1536, September 7, Rom.

Regi christianissimo. Carissime etc. Nuper cum nobis indignum videretur, quod fabrica sacrosanctae basilicae divi Petri de Urbe tam miro et sumptuoso opere a predecessoribus nostris incepta ita neglecta remaneret nec nos ad quos id potissimum pertinebat ob temporum condiciones ac tenues ecclesiae facultates ad illius perfectionem sufficeremus, licet alioqui huic rei quantum poterimus nunquam defuturi simus, ut omnes christifideles in hoc adiutores haberemus eosque ad contribuendum dictae fabricae alliceremus, eorundem predecessorum vestigia sectantes, omnes gratias et indulgentias eidem fabricae per eosdem predecessores et nos concessas confirmavimus, et nonnullas alias etiam de novo concessimus ac unam confraternitatem omnium christifidelium sub invocatione eiusdem divi Petri ereximus, in qua nos ipsos ac S. R. E. cardinales et omnes principes christianos presertimque M^{tem} Tuam descripsimus et annotavimus, prout in aliis nostris sub plumbo desuper confectis literis plenius continetur. Verum cum non dubitemus id etiam Maiestati Tuae pro sua erga Deum pietate et animi religione valde placitum esse et non ignari, quid hactenus in eadem basilica Tuae M^{tis} nomine construi inceptum fuerit, illam hortamur et enixe in Deo domino requirimus, ut *hanc confraternitatem libenti animo ingrediens* tua promptitudine ceteros principes alliciens, *deputatis dictae fabricae omnes oportunos favores praebere velis*, ac officialibus regni et dominiorum tuorum mandari facias, ut literas nostras predictas in eisdem regno et dominiis tuis libere publicari permittant et in quibus opus fuerit *dictis* ad ipsarum literarum executionem deputatis assistant, quod Deo omnipotenti acceptum, tuae in Deum pietati conveniens et nobis gratissimum erit, sicut etiam nuntius apud te noster Tuae M^{ti} ex parte nostra latius explicabit.

Datum Romae apud S. M^[arcum] etc. die 7 septembris 1536 anno 2^o.Feci verbum cum S^{mo} D. N.Hie. card^{lis} Ghinuccius.

Blos.

[Concept. Min. brev. Arm., 41, t. 3, n. 126. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

¹ See *supra*, pp. 635 *seq.* These words in italics are probably meant to be obliterated.

4. LIST OF CHURCHES DEMOLISHED IN ROME FOR THE
EMPEROR'S VISIT.¹

Memoria delle chiese ruinate in Roma doppo la venuta dell' imperatore Carlo V.

In prima s. Lorenzo delli spetiali in campo,² acciò si vedesse le colonne dov' è scritto Divino Antonino et Dive Faustine.

Al pallazzo de m. Aurialo doi chiese una: chiamata santa Margarita verso il coliseo³ et l' altra santa Maria verso torre de Conti⁴ per acrescimento et comodo di detto palazzo.

San Biagio⁵ sotto s. Pietro ad vincula, qual' è stata profanata et al presente ci habita una cortigiana chiamata Angela da Galese.

Doi chiese: una chiamata santo Nicola alla colonna Traiana,⁶ et l' altra s. Andrea alla colonna de Antonino,⁷ acciò si veda dette colonne.

Una chiesa sotto monte Cavallo acanto alli ferapani⁸ quale cascava da se stessa.

Una chiesa per fare la piazza avanti il palazzo della bona memoria del r^{mo} cardinale de Rimini.⁹

Un spedaletto de la Rotonda dietro a detto palazzo per alargare et a drizzare la strada.

Una chiesa per far la strada alla venuta dell' imperatore¹⁰ da s. Marco alle case delli Madaleni.

Un altra chiesa¹¹ appresso la sopradetta, per far la strada dalli Madaleni in campidoglio.

Sono in tutto numero XI.

[Cod. Vat. 8468, f. 208 of the Vatican Library.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 566, and LANCIANI, Scavi, II., 63.

² *I.e.* forum (see ARMELLINI, 2nd ed., 157, and LANCIANI, II., 59).

³ See ARMELLINI, 138.

⁴ Probably S. Maria Magnanapoli (see ARMELLINI, 176).

⁵ S. Biagio ai Monti (see ARMELLINI, 147).

⁶ ARMELLINI, 2nd ed., 167, and LANCIANI, II., 63.

⁷ ARMELLINI (p. 312) states that this church was destroyed by Sixtus V.

⁸ This is written so indistinctly that the statement appears doubtful.

⁹ Oliviero Carafa.

¹⁰ See Vol. XI., p. 242.

¹¹ Probably S. Salvatore in Julia (see ARMELLINI, 2nd ed., 451).

5. POPE PAUL III. TO ANTONIO DA SANGALLO.¹

1538, Januar. 14, Rom.

Dilecto filio Antonio de Sangallo laico Florent, architecto nostro. Alias cum te operae fabricae arcis nostre civitatis Anconae ac capellae et domus nostrae Lauret. prefecissemus, tibi provisionem menstruam 35 duc. auri super pecuniis dictarum fabricarum assignaverimus, cum autem postea te fabricae murorum almae Urbis nostrae prefecerimus, supradictam provisionem cassantes provisionem 25 duc. quolibet mense super pecuniis eiusdem fabricae murorum almae Urbis ad nostrum beneplacitum tibi assignamus, mandantes dictarum pecuniarum depositario et aliis, ad quos spectat, ut durante beneplacito nostro huiusmodi dictam provisionem 25 duc. auri singulis mensibus incipiendo a calendis proxime preteriti tibi persolvant, contrariis non obstantibus quibuscunque.

Dat. Rome 14 ianuarii 1538 a° 4°.

Blos.

[Concept. Min. brev. Arm. 41, t. 9, n. 54. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

6. POPE PAUL III. GRANTS TO THE "FABBRICA" OF ST. PETER'S THE RIVER ANIO.²

1538, August 23, Rom.

Motu proprio etc. Paulus Papa III. Inter alias multiplices curas, quibus a tempore assumptionis nostrae ad summum apostolatus apicem citra illi potissimum continue intenti fuimus, ut dante Domino fabricam basilicae principis apostolorum de Urbe a fel. rec. Iulio papa II predecessore nostro incoatam et quam idem Iulius nec non Leo X, Adrianus VI et Clemens VII etiam Romani pontifices predecessores nostri morte preventi et variis obstantibus impedimentis perficere non potuerunt, omni conatu et totis viribus nostris aggredimur. Cum itaque nuperrime venerabilibus fratribus Paulo Jovio Nucertino, Francisco Pallavicino Aleriensi et Philippo Archinto Burgi S^{ti} Sepulchri episcopis ac dilecto etiam filio Raphaeli de Casalibus eiusdem fabricae prefectis

¹ See *supra*, p. 556.² See *supra*, p. 639.

et deputatis opus fabricae huiusmodi aggrediendum commiserimus ipsique opus fabricae huiusmodi aggredi inceperint et ut illud cum minoribus impensis persequi et usque ad finem perducere possint, existimavimus non modo ipsi fabricae, sed etiam ceteris edificare volentibus valde utile et commodum esse, si flumen Anienis, alias il Teverone, hodie innavigabile effectum, per quod tempore Iulii predecessoris prefati, quia navigabile effectum fuerat, multa ad usum dictae fabricae necessaria ad Urbem conduci solebant, cum aliis juribus et camerae apostolicae ad usum fabricandi pertinentibus eidem fabricae concedamus. Quare tam dictae fabricae quam publicae utilitati et commoditati providere volentes motu simili et ex certa scientia ac de apostolicae potestatis plenitudine eidem fabricae illiusque prefectis et deputatis predictis et pro tempore existentibus ad commodum et utilitatem dictae fabricae predictum flumen Anienis incoando a ponte Lucano prope et extra civitatem nostram Tyburis usque ad illius fauces et illius introitum in Tyberim cum omnibus et singulis ejusdem fluminis Anienis et in dicto flumine ac illius ripis et limitibus utriusque lateris existentibus lagnaminibus et arboribus nec non omnes et singulas excavationes sive mineras Tivertinorum et lapidum cuiusque generis, ac puteolanae nobis et camerae apostolicae pertinentis et quomodolibet spectantis, harum serie gratiose libereque absolute et irrevocabiliter in perpetuum damus, donamus et concedimus [et] assignamus dantes et concedentes eidem fabricae et pro ea prefectis et deputatis plenam et omnimodam facultatem potestatem et auctoritatem flumen ipsum a dicto ponte et usque ad Tiberim pro eo navigabile efficiendo sumptibus dictae fabricae purgandum et mundandum ac arbores cujuscumque generis ac lignamina incidendum excavandum purgari et incidi facien[dum] nec non quibuscunque locis publicis et mineriis predictis nobis ante hanc donationem et camerae apostolicae spectantibus ad eorum libitum ad utilitatem dictae fabricae utendi ac in eis lapides et alia necessaria et ad dictam fabricam apta fodiendum et excavandum ac per dictum flumen Anienis conducendum et navigandum ac omnia et singula predicta ad commodum et utilitatem dictae fabricae convertendum et insuper, quia ad flumen ipsum navigandum necessarius est transitus per possessiones et predia eidem flumini convicina et adhaerentia, quae etiam plena lignis existunt et mundatione et extirpatione indigent, et [si non] mundantur

expense ad mundandum flumen predictum frustratorie essent. Quare desuper opportune providere volentes motu scientia et potestate similibus omnibus et singulis hominibus et personis tam ecclesiasticis quam secularibus quocumque nomine nuncupatis possessionum et prediorum predictorum dominis et arrendatoribus ac possessoribus per apostolica scripta mandamus quatenus infra terminum 8 dierum a die publicationis presentium inchoandum et compareant coram predictis deputatis et coram eis se obligent desuperque fideiussionem prestent de mundando eorum possessiones et predia predicta predicto flumini Anienis convicina et adhaerentia per 4 cannas extra ripas utriusque lateris a dicto ponte Lucano usque ad Tyberim infra terminum eorum arbitrio perficiendum et sub certa poena pro eis imponenda et fabricae applicanda, quo termino elapso nisi comparuerint seque, ut preferitur, minime obligaverint et fideiussionem prestiterint, liceat eisdem deputatis possessiones et predia predicta per dictas 4 cannas mundari facere¹ et omnia ligna incidenda seu excavanda dictae fabricae applicare, prout nos ex nunc in dictum eventum applicamus, si vero comparuerint seque obligaverint et fideiussionem prestiterint, ut preferitur, in termino vero eis prefixo dederint, tunc contra eos ad executionem dictae poenae nec non ad mundationem possessionum et prediorum predictorum pro dicta fabrica deputati ipsi procedant et ad liberum transitum reducant, quorum quidem prediorum et possessionum usum tamen ad effectum per dictas 4 cannas eiusdem fabricae et illius deputatis agentibus et ministris concedimus mandantes omnibus et singulis hominibus et personis ac arrendatoribus et possessoribus quatenus sub dictis poenis observent architectosque conductores et ministros ac agentes dictae fabricae premissa executioni mandare ac per eorum possessiones et predicta predia libere pertransire cum animalibus et vehiculis vel sine permittant. Dilecto vero filio Guido Ascanio Sfortiae sanctorum Viti et Modesti diacono cardinali nostro et S. R. E. camerario ac thesaurario presidentibus et clericis camerae apostolicae quatenus eisdem deputatis in premissis, et quolibet premissorum faveant et assistant, contradictores quoslibet auctoritate nostra sub censuris et aliis eorum arbitrio imponendis poenis compescendo invocato, si opus fuerit, auxilio brachii saecularis et nihilominus deputatis predictis omnimodam iurisdictionem circa

¹ Fecere?

premissa prout in reliquis negotiis dictae fabricae habeant harum serie concedimus non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis privilegiis quoque et indultis ac literis apostolicis quibuscunque. Volumus autem, quod presentis sola signatura sufficiat et ubique fidem faciat in iudicio et extra, regula contraria non obstante et, ut premissa omnia melius omnibusque innotescant, iubemus presentes per urbem solitis locis preconis voce solemniter publicari et publicatio huiusmodi omnes et singulos prefatos arctet ac si presentes eis quarum copiis et sigillo dictae fabricae sigillatis fidem adhiberi volumus et personaliter presentatae fuissent.¹

Fiat motu proprio. A[lexander].

Et quòd presentis concessionis sola signatura sufficiat etc. Fiat. A[lexander].

Datum Romae apud s^{uum} Marcum X cal. septembris anno V.

[Concept. Arm. 11, t. 91, f. 185-185^b. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

7. GIOVANNI DELL' ANTELLA TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF FLORENCE.²

1540, December 18, Rom.

. . . Mi dice mons. Jovio che ci sono lettere di Venetia per le quali se intende che S. M. Ces. fa ogni opera di collegarsi con quella S^{ria} et che promette oltre alle altre cose di fare un duca di Milano che non sia di sangue regio et che per questo S. S^{ta} è intrata in speranza confidando in Madama³ et nei sua denari che S. M. si habbi a risolvere et creare il s^{or} Ottavio, quando i Venetiani descendessino a questa nuova lega, la quale non si crede possi seguire maxime in questi tempi per esser troppo avanti con il Turco con i capitulationi et pare a S. S^{ta} che in Italia nè fuor d' Italia che non sia di sangue regio che stringi più a S. M. che il predicto S^{or} Octavio . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence, Med. 3263.]

¹ Thus in the copy, in which probably some transposition has taken place. According to the sense, the relative sentence belongs to the end, so that the reading ought to be: ac si presentes eis et personaliter presentatae fuissent, quarum copiis et[iam] . . . fidem adhiberi volumus.

² See *supra*, p. 128.

³ Margaret of Austria.

8. CARDINAL ALEANDER TO CARDINAL ALESSANDRO FARNESE.¹

1541, September 12, Rom.

. . . Mi crepa il core di quello ch' è scritto quà della perdita di Buda et ruina dello exercito christiano tanto più havendosi per li Christiani havuto tempo di potervi remediare et se ben più volte con ognuno che non manca di judicio io habbia previsto et predetto tal exito di questa cosa, donde l' homo se ne può pigliar qualche poca di consolatione di tanto male, nondimeno non posso quietarmi dubitando et quasi prevedendo esse prae foribus li medesimi successi al resto della christianità quali furono della Grecia causati dalle discordie delli principi christiani. O tempora o fides o Deus . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Parma.]

9. NINO SERNINI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.²

1541, November 19, Rom.

. . . Io non trovo nissuno a cui basti l' animo di ritirare così in furia quello che nuovamente ha dipinto Michelagnolo per essere opera grande et difficile, essendovi più di cinque cento figure et di sorte che a ritrarne solamente una credo metta pensiero agli dipintori, anchor che l' opera sia di quella bellezza che po pensare V. Ill. S., non manca in ogni modo chi la danna; gli r^{mi} Chietini sono gli primi che dicono non star bene gli inudi in simil luogo che mostrano le cose loro, benchè ancora a questo ha havuto grand^{ma} consideratione, che a pena a dieci di tanto numero si vede dishonestà. Altri dicono che ha fatto Christo senza barba et troppo giovane et che non ha in se quella maestà che gli si conviene, et così in somma non manca chi dica, ma il r^{mo} Cornaro che è stato lungamente a vederla ha detto bene, dicendo che se Michelagnolo gli vuol dare in un quadro solamente dipinta una di quelle figure gli la vuol pagare quello ch' esso gli dimanderà, et ha ragione per essere al creder mio cose che non si possono vedere altrove. Il detto r^{mo} del continuo vi tiene un suo dipintore a ricavare, et ancora che non vi perda punto di tempo non finirà il tutto in manco di quattro mesi, ma con tutto questo vedrò d'

¹ See *supra*, p. 125.² See *supra*, pp. 614, 631.

havere almeno uno schizzo acciò che V. S. Ill. possa vedere il compartimento che ha fatto, che questo non credo la habbia in tutto a sodisfare, et che messer Julio si sarebbe fatto più honore, et sarà opera, quando la vedrà, assai diversa di quello che essa si pensa, perchè si conosce che tutto il suo sforzo ha messo in fare figure bizzarre et in atti diversi, et se pure non potrò così tosto mandarle il disegno mi sforzarò di descriverle almeno il compartimento et ne pigliarà quello poco piacere che potrà. Si dice che N. S. vol che dipinga l'altra capelletta che ha fatta fare S. B^{ne} . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

10. NINO SERNINI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.¹

1541, December 4, Rom.

. . . Non ho mancato di cercare per ogni via di havere il disegno de l' opera che in capella ha fatta Michelagnolo, ma come ho scritto a V. S. Ill. per essere cosa grande et difficile a cavare vi va tempo assai. Sono molti che di continuo la ritranno, fra gli quali ch' è riputato il migliore, uno Mantovano, et si chiama Marcello, che messer Julio lo debbia conoscere, è riputato diligente et che per giovane faccia molto bene. Io ho parlato cum lui per venire a qualche accordo, acciochè la ricavasse tutta, promettendogli che vista che l' avrà V. S. Ill. gli la farà rendere, et acìo che possa attendere a ricavarla volevo aiutarlo che si potesse intertenere, perchè il poveretto da se non ha modo da vivere. Ha voglia di servirla, ma dubito poi di non havere gli disegni, gli quali come saranno forniti estimarà assai. Ha lavorato un mese del continuo senza perdere tempo, et apena ha fornita la barca di Caronte,² nella quale sono infinite figure. Hor consideri V. S. Ill. che tempo vi anderà a fare il resto, poichè si po dire che la barca sia un dito di tutto un corpo, di modo che io dubito che sarà impossibile a trovare verso che quella reste come io vorrei servita per le ragioni sopradette . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 614. Venusti's two drawings still appear in 1627 in the inventory of the ducal palace of Mantua, *Delle Arti di Mantova*, II. (1859), 161, 166.

² Cf. the report of N. Sernini, August 5, 1542, in SOLMI, *Ochino*, 56 *seq.* Solmi thinks, wrongly, that Sernini is here speaking of Fermo Guisoni.

11. GIOVANNI RICCI TO CARDINAL ALESSANDRO FARNESE.¹

1541, December 29, Siena.

Giunsi qui in Siena hiarsera a dui hore di nocte et in la medesima hora fui ad visitar msgr di Granvela et havendoli dato parte di tutto quello che S. St^a me commisse, me rispose comenzando da le cose di Francia et me disse ch' era stato presago et che in Roma haveva preditto a S. B^{ne} chel p^{to} mons. Ardinghello ritornaria con la speditione ch' adesso ritorna subgiungendo che giurava a Dio che non passaria 4 mesi da hoggi che proprio il re christianissimo pregaria S. S^{ta} che rattaccasse la pratica, che hora mostra non si curar, ringratiando sempre S. S^{ta} de boni offitii fatti quantunche non habbiano causato effetto nessun bono. Ha negato che li partiti che msgr Ardinghello ha esposto al re sieno stati per prima ragionati da altri, salvo qualchuno senza saputa di S. M^{ta} non havesse voluto tentar et concludendo che se mai si viderà pace, non sarà si non per la mano di S. B^{ne} el che di questo ne po star sicurissimo.

[Orig. Ricci Archives, Rome, X., 150.]

12. NINO SERVINI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.²

1542, Januar. 4, Rom.

. . . Del luogo dove s' havesse a celebrare il concilio se ragionò di Ferrara et Mantua in la quale al tempo caldo fu detto non esservi buon aere, nè manco sicurezza di havere nissuna delle due città dalli loro signori, di modo che universalmente si inclinava a Trento, et da alcuni r^{mi} fu molto lodato quel luogo, ma il cardinale Trivulzii che mi ha comunicato il resto, fa giudicio che si debbia elegere Piacenza, quando pur se havesse da fare, che n' ha però poca speranza et è d' opinione che non si possa refutare da imperiali ne da Francesi, essendo de N. S. che persevera pure sul neutrale et facciasi in qualsivoglia luogo d' Italia, tien per certo che Lutherani non habbino a comparire. Però detto luogo sarebbe a proposito, ma tien quasi impossibile chel si faccia, considerate in che termine stan le cose del mondo, non vi essendo molta sigurezza che Francia non rompa guerra, et il Turco non assalta

¹ See *supra*, p. 147.² See *supra*, p. 133.

la christianità per mare et per terra, et così Spagnoli non passerebbono sicuri per Francia et Franzesi non si fideriano delle forze dello imperatore, et il mare a quel tempo per l' armata del Turco et de corsari non sarà sicuro, ma quando pure si trovasse modo di farlo, che è difficile, se farà allo spirito santo. Iddio vi metta la sua mano che ve n' è bisogno . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

13. POPE PAUL III. TO FRANCIS I., KING OF FRANCE.¹

1542, Mart. 27, Rom.

Charissime etc. Referet M^{ti} tuae nonnulla nostro nomine dil. fil. Ioh. de Montepolitiano, noster camerarius secretus, presentium exhibitor, super quibus optamus eam fidem per M^{tem} Tuam ei haberi, quam nobis ipsis haberet, si cum ea presentes loqueremur.

The following postscript is certainly in the Pope's own hand :

La M^{ta} V. Christ^a per la sua singular prudentia adverta bene in questa occasione di concludere una tanto sancta et necessaria pace, non posser fare majore servitio a Dio et cosa più degna di se et de li sui gloriosissimi titoli, ne posser assequire piu segnalata victoria che sarà di vincer se istessa, et in quel tempo dove più poteria demonstrar el suo vigore, lo quale deve reservar ad proseguir le actioni gloriose de li sui progenitori: defension et exaltation de la sancta fede christiana et sua perpetua gloria.

[Orig. Ricci Archives, Rome, VII., n. 12.]

14. NINO SERNINI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.²

1542, April 22, Rom.

. . . Et con l' ultime lettere di 5 di questo è venuta nuova che Alemanni si contentono di Trento, benchè più gli saria piaciuta Colonia et un' altro luogo; con questo aviso mercordì in concistoro N. S. ne parlò lung^{te} concludendo che si facesse la bolla lassando in bianco per mo[do] il luogo et tempo, ma si conosceva che per le sue parole sarebbe Trento, et così sarà vicino a Mantova et il tempo al più lungo verso settembre; d' altra cosa non si parlò . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 147.

² See *supra*, p. 144.

15. AVERRARDO SERRISTORI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF FLORENCE.¹

1542, August 11, Rom.

. . . P. S. Il rev. Pucci m' ha fatto intender come di poi concistoro Sua S^{ta} lo chiamò . . . et li disse come haveva fatto pigliar in Lucca per conto di eresia due frati de quali uno se n' è fuggito in Pisa. The duke might give help towards their arrest.

[Orig. State Archives, Florence.]

16. LATTANZIO TOLOMEI TO SIENA.²

1542, August 11, Rom.

Due stemperamenti del mondo vanno al presente attorno che danno timore, l' uno è quello dele querre, l' altro è quello dele heresie, massime perchè si intende non solo havere infetta la Germania ma essersi sparso ancora in Italia et nominatamente in Lucca. Qual disordine intendendosi ha dato occasione di fare una deputatione di cardinali a questo effetto qual si pensa che habbi ad essere come una inquisitione generale et particolarmente con li signori Lucchesi al presente si tratta di tor via li disordini che a poco a poco per negligentia di chi vi doveva provvedere sono cresciuti in quella città, quale et per lettere et per homo a posta et per bocca del cardinale loro Guidiccione si mostra pronta a fare ogni remedio ; et questo scrivo parte come nuova de le cose che occorranò quà et parte per fare intendere a Vostre Illustrissime Signorie che in tra li altri avvisi di heresie, che ci sono, son stati nominati ancora certi luoghi del territorio vostro, come Sarteano et Montalcino acciocchè parendo a quelle vi ponghino le urecchie ; benchè la cura sopra le heresie paia et sia cosa spirituale, perchè essendo in li principii de la reformatione de lo stato vostro fatta mentione ancora di questo non sarebbe forse fuori di proposito intendendosi esser così di avvertirne li ordinarii et eshortarli a tenerne buona cura et offerirli ogni opportuno favore. Questo io dirò di mio giuditio che a me la religion pare il fondamento de la vita humana et che mai si faccia alteratione in quella che non vi si accompagni alteratione et variatione del

¹ See *supra*, p. 509.² See *supra*, pp. 504, 509.

stato secolare ; et per questo sarebbe forse da tenerne cura non solo per conscientia, ma per prudentia acciò non si turbasse la quiete ancora ne le cose temporali. Buona fama credo ne acquisterebbero Vostre Illustrissime Signorie et appresso a Nostro Signore quà gratia non piccola.

In tra li altri ordini di frati in questa contagione disordinati sono stati nominati li Scappuccini di fra Bernardino et per questo intendo che sua paternità è stata chiamata quà da Sua Beatitudine per trovare a questa cosa remedio essendo vera. Quando sarà quà mi ricorderò di nuovo instare per haverlo questa quadragesima, si come l' arcivescovo et Vostre Illustrissime Signorie più volte mi hanno commesso, a le quali di continuo con reverentia mi raccomando.

Di Vostre Illustrissime Signorie.
obsequentissimo ser Lattantio Tolomei.
[Orig. State Archives, Siena.]

17. CARDINAL ALESSANDRO FARNESE TO GIOVANNI POGGIO.¹

1542, August 19, Rom.

Il r^{mo} Sadoletto legato al re di Francia partì di Roma non hieri l' altro per il suo viaggio, el quale farà con tutta la celerità possibile alla età et grado suo, perchè così ha in commissione di fare. Porta seco brevi et istruzioni piene di tutta quella efficatia et caldezza che si possi immaginare maggiore per fermar l' armi et procurare la pace o almeno la osservantia della tregua. Ancorachè alla necessità che si trova hormai ridotta la povera christianità la pare sola senz' alcun altro mezo si quella che ci possa assicurare dall' ultima roina, nondimeno quando questo non si possa, ha in commissione di fare ogni instantia nella osservantia della tregua et nell' una cosa et nell' altra spendere senza alcuna reservatione tutta l' autorità di Nostro Signore et di questa Santa Sede.

Al rev^{mo} Contarini destinato per Sua Maestà Cesarea si è mandato hoggi il Montepulciano in poste ad portare le istruzioni et altre cose necessarie per la partita, la quale si è sollecitata et si sollecita in modo che senza dilatione sua sig^a r^{ma} si metterà ella

¹ Cf. EHSSES, Conc. Trid., IV., 283, and *supra*, p. 149.

anchora in viaggio. Et però V. S. tanto più ha da procurare quanto le scrissi con el corriere acciochè questa diligentia di N. S^{re} possa fare frutto.

[Orig. Chigi Library, Rome, L-III., 65, f. 260.]

18. NINO SERNINI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.¹

1542, August 26, Rom.

. . . Per quanto io ho possuto ritrare, N. S. haveva deliberato in cambio del cardinale Contarino mandare in Spagna il Morone, ma il Viseo s' è tanto afatigato et pregato et supplicato ch' è stato eletto esso, et per questo effetto questa mattina s' è fatta congregatione nella quale N. S. l' ha proposto, dicendo chel negotio ha bisogno di celerità et ch' esso s' è offerto andare in su le poste, et che questa andata gli potria giovare per assettare le cose sue col mezzo et autorità dell' imperatore, et saria ancora la via di quietare il re di Portugallo et pacificarlo con la sede apostolica. Queste sono le ragioni dette da S. B^{ne} . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

19. NINO SERNINI TO CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.²

1542, October 14, Rom.

. . . Mercordì al solito fu concistoro, nel quale N. S. parlò lungamente delli travagli del mondo et disse in quanti pericoli si trovano tutta christianità, di poi ricordò avvicinarsi il tempo del concilio, et però era necessario risolvere se si dovevano mandare legati a Trento, volendo inferire per le sue parole essere fuori di proposito considerato che standogli principi christiani in sul arme si vede chiaramente non essere il tempo da celebrarlo, et per questa ragione quelli ch anno mal animo potriano dire essere fatta questa diligentia senza proposito. Li cardinali risposono che essendo la cosa di molta importantia pigliavano tempo a pensarvi maturamente sopra et si risolverà nel primo concistoro. Intendo che molti cardinali inclinano che vi si mandeno, acciochè Luterani

¹ See *supra*, p. 150.

² See *supra*, p. 154.

non habbino cagione de dire che resti da N. S., la cui S^{ta} pare che sia d' altra openione et non inclina a mandarvegli, et se pure vi gli manderà se ragiona del mastro di sacro palazzo et del Morone . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

20. INSTRUCTION FOR DIONYSIUS, GUARDIAN OF THE CONVENT OF SION IN JERUSALEM, AS VISITOR OF THE MARONITES OF LEBANON.¹

1542, November 20 [Rom].

Instrutione mandata al guardiano de Monte Sion in Hierusalem quale è deputato a visitare li Maroniti del Monte Libano alli 20 de novembre 1542. Et la portò frate Felice da Venetia.

Pigliate dal rev^{mo} patriarca et suo consiglio le infrascritte informationi.

In prima circa la scrittura vecchia et nova se hanno più o memo libri di quelli che hanno li Greci et li Latini, cioè della scrittura vecchia cinque libri di Moisé, uno di Josue, uno delli Judici, uno di Ruth, due di Samuel, due delli Re, due de li Paralipomenon.

Et de la nova lo evangielio di S. Mattheo. Di poi si hanno constitutioni delli apostoli, cioè di Pietro e di Paulo o di alcuno altro apostolo et se hanno li sette canoni de gli apostoli.

Item se hanno li acti del concilio Niceno primo congregato sotto Costantino magno et Silvestro papa di Roma et se hanno più che vinti canoni del detto concilio.

Item se hanno li acti de li altri concilii generali et provintiali et li canoni loro et le interpretationi come hanno li Greci et li Latini et insomma di quanti concilii hanno li acti et di quanti li canoni soli.

Item quante historie ecclesiastiche hanno et di quali autori et come grandi et se sono state tradotte di altre lingue o composte in lingua Maronitica.

Item se credono, che la lingua Maronitica litterale che usano in libri sacri et la Caldea antica sia la medesima et se credono

¹ See *supra*, pp. 521, 547; WADDING, XVIII., 359; Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift, 1845, No. 50.

che in Jerusalem al tempo di Christo si parlasse vulgarmente in lingua Caldea, cioè lingua Hebraea mista et che Christo parlasse in la lingua, nella quale è scritto lo evangelio, che loro hanno di Mattheo, et se credono che questo evangelio di Mattheo che loro hanno sia quel medesimo che scrisse Mattheo, non solo quanto alli sensi ma quanto alle parole anchora.

Item potendo havere delli libri loro della scrittura pigliateli più emendati che si po et mandateceli. Et se hanno chi sappi scrivere la lingua Caldea, in characteri Hebraici pigliate li detti libri anchora scritti in characteri Hebrei, cioè pigliate tutta la scrittura loro prima scritta in li lor characteri Chaldeici overo Maronitici et di poi havendo commodità di tal scritture, come è detto pigliate la medesima scrittura loro in lingua Caldeica, overo Maronitica scritto in charateri Hebrei et nominatamente lo evangelio di Mattheo, et è facile che si trovi qualche uno di loro che sappi così scrivere et li Hebrei nostri di quà scrivano tutte le cose loro Caldee in characteri Hebreici et possendo menar con voi uno di loro che sappi bene interpretar in lingua Greca o vulgare o litterata o nostra vulgare o Arabica menatelo purchè sia suficientemente litterato. Item pigliate lo indice di tutta la bibliotеча loro et di tutti i libri che loro ve informarano che si potessono havere dalle bande di là et questo indice sia in lingua Greca o vulgare nostra o Latina, et pigliate informatione se in Antiochia et altre città vicini sono libri Grechi.

Item pigliate una informatione di tutte le cose della fede loro et anchora dimandate delle cose della fede come passano in li paesi loro vicini et lontani anchora verso la Arabia et India et verso la Armenia et come vi sono Christiani et se vi sono chiese et vescovi, et se tengono la fede secondo il rito o nostro o Greco o pure sono heretici.

Item oltra a libri pigliate ancora medaglie di qualonque sorte et con qualonque inscriptione le trovate d' oro, d' argento et di rame.

Item pigliate tutte le iscriptioni che troverete in li marmi antichi o siano in caracteri Greci o Latini o Hebraici o Caldaici, et quello che non sapete scrivere posendo pingetelo.

[Copy. Secret Archives of the Vatican, Bibl. Pia 170, f. 76-77.]

21. INSTRUCTION FOR M. GRIMANI, PATRIARCH OF AQUILEJA,
AS NUNCIO IN SCOTLAND.¹

1543, April 1 [Rom].

Inprima andar con ogni diligenza alla corte di Francia e presentare al re christianissimo il breve suo credentiale in lui e in virtù della sua credentia exponerli la causa, perchè N^{ro} S^{re} l' invii in Scotia, cioè per procurare la liberatione del rev^{mo} cardinale di s. Andrea,² quando a quell' hora non fusse liberato, e per ajutare a mantenere e difendere quel regno nella fede catholica e libertà sua antica ecc., si come prudentemente Sua M^{ta} Christianissima l' ha ricordato e instato a Sua Beat^{ne} per le quali due cose, come Sua S^{ta} ha concesso hora le sei decime ecc. secondo che il re in vita sua l' havea supplicato, così non è per mancare d' ogni altro ajuto necessario, fino che harà forza alcuna della sede apostolica rappresentando qui la stima che Sua Beat^{ne} tiene di quel regno, l' affettione che porta alla regina et a tutti li principi et persone private d' esso.

Item discorrere con Sua M^{ta} Christianissima qual modo gli paresse migliore, per assicurare et acquietare gl' animi di quei nobili et evitar tumulti e seditioni, et quando Sua M^{ta} giudicasse esser espediente di dar quanto più presto un re a quel regno, come quì è stato ricordato a Sua Beat^{ne}, si potria pigliare il bon parere di essa Sua M^{ta} per far poi ogni opera di metterlo in essecutione, stimandosi che per la prudenza sua et per la pratica c' ha di quel regno, e per l' amore, quale li porta, non possa parerli se non cosa da esser utile e ben fatta.

Item consigliarsi con la M^{ta} Sua del tempo et modo del passar in Scotia securamente senza mettersi a pericoli d' Inglesi, e quando a Sua M^{ta} non piacesse questa passata sicura o necessaria non dovete passa più oltra ; ma femandovi in Francia, et avvisando di tutto Sua S^{ta} aspettar risposta ; come per contrario quando Sua M^{ta} vi conforti a passare e mostri modo sicuro, dovete senza altro avviso di quà seguire il vostro viaggio fino in Scotia, avvertendo d' andar salvo e per rispetto della persona vostra e de vostri e per rispetto della sede apostolica. Ma in qualche modo vi resolviate passare o non passare, dovete dar le lettere, che portarete per la corte di

¹ See *supra*, p. 472. For Grimani see UGHELLI, V., 133.² Beaton.

Francia e visitar la reina, madama Margarita, madama de Etampes, e gl' altri signori e dame della corte, come per la vostra prudenza saprete fare, non lassando indrieto li rev^{mi} cardinali di Tornon e Ferrara ¹ et il cardinale di Loreno e mons. di Ghisa.

Giungendo in Scotia dovete andar dritto a visitar la reina e quelli che si trovaranno al governo del regno e benedicendoli in nome die Sua S^{ta} dar a ciascuno il suo breve con esponere la causa della vostra andata, come è detto di sopra. Et a caso che il rev^{mo} cardinale di S. Andrea sia liberato, come si desidera e spera, visitarlo, darli il suo breve e comunicarli tutta la commissione vostra non facendo cosa alcuna senza il consiglio e parer suo, essendo practico, molto esperto et de buona mente, col quale quel che risolverete a beneficio del regno, Sua S^{ta} harà per resoluto, e quando non fusse ancor liberato, che Dio il cessi, dovete con la reina e con gl' altri grandi attendere con ogni vostra forza alla sua liberatione, non potendo essere a Sua Beat^{ne} più a cuore, ch' è.

Item dirgli la facultà qual portate di far riscuotere dal clero del regno sei decime, secondo, ch' in parte il re clare mem. aveva in vita supplicato a Sua S^{ta} e persuadendo il clero a pagarle volentieri. Ordinarete col parer della reina e delli sig^{ri} deputati al governo del regno, che si deputino uno o più thesorieri di esse decime, persone di buon credito e da bene, nelle mani de quali il denaro habbia a pervenire, e poi spendersi come parerà meglio alla reina et a quelli c' haveranno cura del regno. La stanza vostra sarà o in corte o dove a voi et alli sopradetti deputati et al cardinale, quando sia libero, parerà meglio e più espediente.

Le cerimonie devono essere con gravità et affabilità insieme senza alcuna ostentatione.

Le facultà deveno esser usate a servigio di Nro Sre Iddio et in edificatione e commodo di quel regno, et in questo harete molta cura alle mani de vostri ministri ad imitatione del rev^{mo} card^{le} Polo e d' altri, che gl' anni passati hanno havuto legationi in quelle parti ecc. Le lettere si deveno indirizzare al nuntio di Francia, al quale si dà ordine, che le dia presto e bon ricapito.

Nascendo occasione di poter fare qualche officio bono con Inghilterra si rimette in la prudenza vostra, avvertendovi però di non entrare in cosa, che possa esser di danno o di vergogna alla republica christiana et alla sede apostolica.

¹ Ippolito d' Este.

La stanza vostra in quel regno sarà più longa o più breve, secondo le occorrentie, e quando il tempo serva ad avvisare Sua S^{ta} del parer vostro et aspettar risposta, dovete farlo, e quando per qualunque caso non servisse, si rimette questa risoluzione alla prudenza vostra, si come anco in l' altre cose sopraditte quando vi paresse ragionevolmente di doverne variare alcuna lo potrete fare, massime col consiglio del cardinale sig^r Andrea ove sia liberato ecc. e quando lo stato delle cose fusse tale, che la M^{ta} Christianissima e quelli, che governano il regno di Scotia havessero charo d' esser ajutati a molestar Inghilterra. Si trovano in questo paese alcuni personaggi di quel regno quali per servizio d' Iddio, beneficio di quell' isole e commodità di Scozzesi esponano le persone loro ad ogni pericolo, e forse non senza gran frutto, il che secondo l' occasione e la dispositione, che troverete, possete significar al re christianissimo prima e poi in Scotia o non significare, come a voi parerà.

[Copy. Arm. II., t. 49, f. 68-69^b. Secret Archives of the Vatican, also in the Doria-Pamphili Archives, Rome, Istruz. I., 357 *seq.*]

22. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO FERRANTE GONZAGA.¹

1544, Mart. 18, Mantua.

. . . Sendo tornato Farnese dalla sua legation ha portato il parentato di Vittoria col duca d' Orlens nella manica, perchè il re gli ha dato ampla facultà di dir al papa, che lo publichi mo a suo piacer. Pur non si fidando interam^{te} delle parole di S. S., vorebbe prima, ch' ella si dichiarasse francese, a che tant' è inclinata, che già l' haveria fatto tenendo l' imperator per inimico, et ove le vien ben in publico et in privato, in concistoro et fuori di dargli qualche cinghiata, non gliene sparagna alcuna, ma il duca di Castro, che adesso è tutto spirituale, ogni dì dice l' officio grande et si fa predicar et legger l' epistole di San Paulo con mostrar una mutation grandiss^a della vita sua, al quale N. S. presta gran fede et dice, ch' è ben mo secundum cor suum et che li suoi consili sono molto buoni et assai più gli crede, ch' a tutti gli altri Farnesi insieme, ha detto a S. S., che non può nè deve dichiararsi francese, perchè

¹ See *supra*, pp. 183, 189, 191.

bisogneria poi, che pigliasse l' arme contra l' imperator, che sarebbe cagione della rovina di tutta la casa, ch' anno pur nelle mani del sangue di S. M^{ta} ch' è Madama et che li stati loro sono sotto la protezione d' essa M^{ta}, et finalm^{te} si verrebbe a ingarbugliar tutta Italia, di maniera che per tali consili il papa discorrendone con Castro si risolve di pregar il re, che sia contento comandargli ogn' altra cosa eccetto che questa dichiarazione, perchè non solamente allui, ma a tutto il mondo farà conoscer con l' opere, che in ogni modo è Francese et con denari et con genti sotto color di mandargli contra Inghilterra, non mancherà d' aiutarlo et favorirlo sempre, la dove questa dichiarazione potrebbe fornargli in danno grande et senza alcuno profitto di S. S., così sono rimasti insieme in questa conclusione. Il papa onninamente voleva far cardinali a queste ceneri cioè tre o quattro de suoi, ma il buon duca, ch' è stato quattro dì a posta in palazzo per queste consulte dette di sopra, l' ha confortato a non farli, dicendo, che se ancho non ne faceva a petition de principi, saria stata cosa con dispiacer de tutti massim^{te} del re et dell' imperator, se ben esso imperator non de domanda et che mostri non se ne curar, neanche delli già fatti. Pure Burgos ha fatto intender a S. S., che S. M^{ta} si truova pochissimi cardinali, per esserne mancati assai, et che tanti ve ne sono di Francesi, et ogni dì più se ne fa, ch' ella di doi cardinali non solamente resterebbe contenta, se non ne avesse almeno 4 o 5. Però tale creatione s' è diferita con disegno d' essequirla il dì del letare che seguirà, et sarà la domenica avanti quella di passione, et ha scritto al re, che se non gli fosse dispiacer, non vorrebbe far cardinali ad instantia de principi, per non ne far all' imperator, pur ancho s' accomodarà al voler d' esso re. Et così secondo la risposta ch' averà si governerà, et ne fa ogni modo o pochi o assai. Farnese ha riferito a S. S., ch' el imperator non gli lasciò finir l' ambasciata, che interrompendolo gli disse: Mons^{or}, voi havete Monreale per noi, vostro padre il ducato di Novara, il duca Ottavio ha la nostra diletta figliuola cò 20^m sc. d' entrata, et per far piacer a S. S., habbiamo tolerata la rovina di doi carissⁱ amici nostri, il duca d' Urbino et il s. Ascanio Colonna, che con un sol nostro cenno haveriano fatto del mal' assai, et poi siamo trattati così, che un vicario di Christo, che ancho ha ricevuti tanti benefici da noi, si voglia adherir al re di Francia o piuttosto al Turco nimici espressi della fede, onde si doleva amaram^{te} di S. S. et gli

disse, che dovesse per suo bene farla avertita, che guardasse ben bene ciò che faceva, che non le intravenesse di quel che fece a Clemente, bravando un poco a tale che lo rimandò confuso. Ora, mons. mio rev^{mo}, quanti mesi et forse anni sono che io dico a V. S. R^{ma}, ch' el papa è Francese, lo vederà pur mo et lo toccherà con mano, se poi gli avisi miei non sono accetti et che non facciano frutto, patientia, almeno mi consola questo ch' ella conoscerà la verità, perchè nel primo concistoro si leggerà la pragmatica. [Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5792, f. 18-19^b of the Vatican Library.]

23. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO MONSIGNORE DE ROSSI.¹

1545, Mart. 7, Mantua.

Voi v' ingannate di gran lunga, se pensate, che tra cesar e 'l papa sia buona intelligenza, perchè vi dico io certiss^o, che v' è poca satisfation in ciascuno d' essi del compagno. Cesar ha mostrato grandiss^o dispiacer, ch' el papa non habbia fatto cardinale il Pazocco, lo stringe a restituir lo stato al s. Ascanio senza parentato, tira avanti il concilio et gli ricerca a depositar nellamagna 600^m sc. per l' impresa contra il Turco. Il papa si duole, che cesar sia implacabile, da parole generali della restitution dello stato al s. Ascanio, che non sono accettate, et dice voler mandar Farnese a S. M^{ta} per metter tempo in mezzo. I ministri di lei si sono aveduti del tutto et hanno detto a S. S., che più non vogliono scriver parole, ma che venendo a fatti scriveranno, a tale che le cose sono molto alterate.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5792, f. 144^b of the Vatican Library.]

24. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO THE DUKE OF FERRARA.²

1545, Mart. 28, Mantua.

Quanto mo all' andata di Farnese alla corte Ces^a, V. Ecc. sa, che quando Trento³ fu a Roma, egli propose, ch' esso Farnese v' andasse, ma con uno deposito in mano di 400^m sc. da spender,

¹ See *supra*, p. 203.

² See *supra*, p. 217.

³ Cardinal Madruzzo.

bisognando così nella guerra contra infideli come in aiuto de Catholici contra Lutherani, il papa allhora biassò la cosa nè si risolse altramente ma havendo dappoi scoperto ogni dì più l' animo dell' imperator, ha terminato finalm^{te} mandar Farnese, et di nuovo consultata la cosa con Trento per mezzo del card. s. Croce è stato persuaso a farlo, ma col deposito. S. B. ha replicato che dubita, che a Farnese non sia fatto qualche scorno andandovi, Trento ha risposto, che si mandi il Mignanello, et quanto al deposito, intendo ch' ella vorrebbe riducerlo a 100^m sc. et non più, a tale che non satisfarà. Il Mignanello disse ancho, che prima della partita sua di Roma l' andata di Farnese era molto calda, ma che nel suo partir gli pareva poi che fosse tutta raffreddata, di maniera che non sapeva che se ne dir, pur io credo, ch' egli andrà, et ch' el papa farà ogni cosa per adolcir l' imperator et gli ungerà le mani di buona somma di scudi.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5792, f. 153 of the Vatican Library.]

25. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO THE DUKE OF FERRARA.¹

1545, April 26, Mantua.

Conversation with Cardinal Farnese about what would happen should the Pope die during his absence from Rome: et dicendogli io che ve n' era ben anchora per un pezzo, mi rispose non esser così, perch' ella non cavalcava si può dir quasi più nè tanto passeggiava quanto soleva far, et che in somma pareva adesso che molto fosse invecchiata et cascata . . .

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5792, f. 166^b of the Vatican Library.]

26. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO THE DUKE OF FERRARA.²

1545, Juni 4, Mantua.

Farnese called upon me to-day: Pur mi ha detto, che non ha havuto troppa difficultà a render ben capace l' imperator del buon animo di N. S., et che piuttosto gli è stato di bisogno ributtar la cortesia di S. M^{ta}, che niente inducerla adusarla, come quella che

¹ See *supra*, p. 218.

² See *supra*, p. 223.

ben conosce, che per suo servizio le mette conto d' intendersi ben con S. S. Intorno al concilio m' ha detto, che la cosa è rimessa al papa, et che solam^{te} l' imperator ricorda, che terminando la triegua tra Lutherani et Catholici ogni volta ch' esso concilio s' apra per quello ch' ordinò S. M., che stessimo in pace fin a tanto che si facesse o nazionale o generale, senza alcun dubbio Lutherani faranno una schiavina a Catholici per esser più in numero, meglio ad ordine et più uniti, et che pure se ne rimetteva al papa. Farnese dice mo, che S. S. farà qualche cosa, che a mio giudicio sarà ben poco, come a dir tre o quattro sessioni et qui finirla, non mi parendo verisimile, che di nuovo sia per far altra prorogatione, poichè la sua fortunazza gli ha dato così bel modo d' uscir d' un tanto labyrintho. E esso Farnese m' è paruto tutto humile et piacevole . . .

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5792, f. 170^b-171 of the Vatican Library.]

27. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO THE DUKE OF FERRARA.¹

1545, Juni 30, Mantua.

The Pope sets about great military preparations. Dunque si concluderà, che vadano nellamagna, dove il papa sommamente disidera metter le mani, si per far quello che deve contra gli heretici, come per gratificar all' imperator in cosa che non gli apporti più inimicitia di quella che si truovi fin' adesso; perch' a pensar, ch' essa gente sia per andar in Ungheria, hora che si tratta della triegua in Constantinopli, mi par una vanità grande.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5792, f. 182 of the Vatican Library.]

28. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO THE DUKE OF FERRARA.²

1545, August 18, Mantua.

. . . Quelle ragionazze masticate in due hore ch' el papa allega per colorir il dubbio della rovina et della recuperation della Chiesa sono si goffe che quasi è vergogna a parlarne; pur io voglio che veggiamo ciò che vagliono et primamente dove dice, che per esser

¹ See *supra*, p. 226.

² See *supra*, p. 231.

quelle due terre discoste dal resto dello stato della Chiesa ecc., se ciò valesse, non bisognerebbe dar ancho una via ad Avignone, ch' è molto più discosta et in mezzo si può dir di Francia; poi se per la spesa si debbono alienar, a questo modo saria meglio alienar ancho Bologna, la quale divenendo hora frontiera dello stato della Chiesa, converrà che sia fortificata, com' è stata Piacenza et che sempre vi si faccia una buona spesa per guardarla. Appresso se quelle due terre sono state anticamente donate alla Chiesa et a Christo, come si donano i patrimonii delle chiese, ch' a da far il papa d' alienarle, sono forse le sue, non è egli pure amministratore d' esse come io di questi beni del mio vescovato, è forse il papa signor delle terre della Chiesa? Ora guardiamo un poco la bella ricompensa, che per quelle vuol dar di Camerino et di Nepe, uno che non è suo, ma d' altrui di ragion, et l' altro, che fu dato all' unico Aretino per mille o poco più scudi d' entrata et che pure non è suo, poichè sarà quel così cieco, che voglia comparar due bicocche alle due migliori città di Lombardia così d' entrata come di paese, vassalli et d' ogn' altra cosa, che si debba in un simile caso considerar. Quanto al multiplicar de vassalli, in questo ha ben grandissima ragion, poichè s' acquistano per esser molto utili alla Chiesa, quando ancho sono di valor nell' arme, ma se questo militasse, perchè non si da Faenza alli Manfredi, Arimine alli Malatesti et tutte le altre cittadi a quelli che n' erano signori, per haver più bella corte et per multiplicar in più vassalli? Io scempio mi sto a beccar il cervello facendo invettive, et il buon vecchiarello si sguazza il mondo felicissimo.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5793, f. 6 of the Vatican Library.]

29. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO THE DUKE OF FERRARA.¹

1545, August 23, Mantua.

Certo, chel vecchiarello ha molta ragion di non solamente disegnar di far la nipote principessa di Spagna, ma anchor il futuro duca di Piacenza re di Spagna, di Francia et di tutto, poich' ogni cosa gli riesce così bene. A noi altri, che senza tanta buona sorte habbiamo i stati per li nostri antichi con tante fatiche e stenti guadagnati et che con altre tante agnoscie si

¹ See *supra*, p. 233.

conservano, pare una strana cosa il veder far un duca di due simili città in una notte come nasce un fungo ; ma poichè così Dio vuole et che non ci habbiamo a far più che tanto, man' a ridersi della ladra fortuna et porre in lettere maiuscole quelle parole si grandi et insolenti: C' E ANCHO NOSTRA NIPOTE, acciò che siano a tutti essemplio di prospera fortuna, la quale neanche sia perhò si ferma, che non possa far dar volta a quella sua instabile ruota com' è d' usanza. Io considerando questi gran fatti del vecchiarello, mi vado risolvendo, che per V. Ecc. sia meglio, che quell' animale d' Ottavio habbia le due città, che se continovassero in poter della Chiesa, si per esser lui manco atto a farle danno nelle cose di Modena et di Reggio, si ancho perchè quando la Chiesa vorà far delle imprese piutosto comincerà da Piacenza et da Parma che dalle città di V. Ecc., havendole com' ella le tiene per sententia dell' imperator et per accordo col papa.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5793, f. 6^b-7 of the Vatican Library.]

30. CARDINAL FARNESE TO CARDINAL MORONE.¹

1545, August 23, Rom.

Il Vignola architetto comparse inanti a N. S. et mostrò a S. S^{ta} li disegni dell' opera da farsi in la chiesa di san Petronio, et con tutto che habbia aspettato lungamente li altri concorrenti, non sono però mai comparsi, essendo già tanto tempo stati chiamati come V. S. R^{ma} si può ricordare, la onde ritornando egli costà mi è parso accompagnarlo con questa mia a V. S. R^{ma} et raccomandarglielo, acciochè si come egli prontamente è comparso qui con animo che li suoi disegni si ponessero a comparatione delli altri, così V. S. R^{ma} pigli la sua protettione, et in questo edificio di san Petronio egli vi habbia quel loco che l' opere sue meritano, et che non comporti, che sia oppresso dalli favori delli altri ecc. Certificando V. S. R^{ma} che di tutto quello aiuto et favore che li prestarà, io ne riceverò molto piacere . . .

[Orig. Nuntiat. di Bologna, CLXXVII., f. 29. Secret
Archives of the Vatican.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 593.

31. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO CAMILLO CAPILUPI.¹

1546, Juli 23, Mantua.

. . . In questi nipoti del papa si vede estremo desiderio di servir al imperator, e credo che S. M^{ta} con qualche buona ciera che faccia loro gli governerà insieme col papa come vorà, ma dall' altro canto sono pieni di tanta speranza et si gonfi di soccorso che conducono in questo bisogno di S. M., che penso che Siena et Cremona pareriano loro niente.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5793, f. 134 of the Vatican Library.]

32. CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA TO FERRANTE GONZAGA.²

1546, October 13, Mantua.

. . . Sopra il papa si puo far poco fundamento per l' età sua et più per la voluntà, la quale per me credo, che non potesse esser peggior contra l' imperator di quel che sia, et il soccorso datogli in quella benedetta impresa con lasciarlo poi morir di fame e di necessità non è stato per altro che per riducerlo a termine, che fosse sforzato far ricorsa a S. S., che si truova gagliarda di denari, che può levarlo di necessità cavandogli dalle mani una Siena o qualche altra cosa a modo suo.

[Concept. Cod. Barb. lat. 5793, f. 171 of the Vatican Library.]

33. GIROLAMO TIRANNO TO URBINO.³

1546, December 11, Rom.

. . . Hoggi il papa parlandone in concistoro et proponendo di farne qualche segno di ringratiamento verso Dio come sarebbe stato d' una messa del Spirito Santo vi furono diverse sententie delli r^{mi} sopra questa proposta. Et per la parte degl' imperiali fu allegato esservi lettere di XXX in Giovanni di Vega che verificavano la fuga et dispersione, benchè il papa habbia havuto a dire che egli afferma d' haverle; ma però non le mostra. La

¹ See *supra*, p. 303.

² See *supra*, p. 321.

³ See *supra*, p. 325.

conclusione è stata che s' habbia d' aspettarne nuovo aviso et così qua insomma chi la crede a un modo et chi all' altro. E quelli che credono per vera la dissolutione, alcuni l' attribuiscono alla stagione, la quale sola in questi tempi sia bastante a diffendere quella provincia dall' arme di cesare, altri che sia per accordo che possa esser nato tra Sua Maestà et la Germania. Gran cosa però pare a tutti che in una tanta fuga non vi siano avisi di quel che sia avvenuto così delli cariaggi come dell' artellaria grossa. Questa opinione dell' accordo viene ancora confermata d' alcune parole che raccontano esser state usate da mons^r Granvela verso il nuncio di S. S^{tà}, il quale essendo da Sua M^{tà} stato rimesso allui sopra la querela che faceva della sententia data dal senato di Milano in favore del s^r Hier^o da Cortemaggiore del non essere suddito di Piacenza, et detto nuncio exaggerandola col mettere inanzi li meriti di Sua S^{tà} verso cesare et specialmente di questa spesa della guerra, pare che detto mons^{re} Granvela forte turbato et in collera havesse a rispondere: che spesa? che Parma et Piacenza? Il papa havrebbe fatto il meglio a dare del suo che quel d' altri et d' una in altra parola prorompesse in questa, che potria essere che gl' eserciti di Germania si trovassero un giorno in mezzo Roma, et le parole di contesa multiplicassero in tanto che detto Granvela quasi spingesse il nuncio fuora della sua stanza, benchè tutto questo Spagnuoli habbino escusato sul male di Granvela, che in quel punto lo teneva tutto fastidioso et non lo lasciava dare orecchi volentieri nè a queste nè ad altre querele. Ma non so già come s' escusino i protesti che tuttavia hanno fatto in campo contra S. S^{tà} dell' inosservanza della capitulatione per mancanza delle paghe . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence, Urb. 266, f. 588.]

34. POPE PAUL III. TO KING FERDINAND I.¹

1547, Mai 20, Rom.

Regi Romanorum. Charissime etc. Gadium nostrum quod ex serenissimi fratris tui tuaque recenti victoria publice privatimque accepimus, cumularunt litterae Serenitatis Tuae rem ipsam nobis plenius et particularius perscribentes, de quo eidem Serenitati

¹ See *supra*, p. 361.

Tuae gratias agimus. Licet enim id antea cognovissemus atque undecunque agnitum habituri fuisset gratissimum, tamen aliquanto gratius nobis est factum ipsa Serenitate Tua scribente. Itaque eidem serenissimo fratri tuo et tibi ac nobis ipsis ex animo gratulantes Deo optimo maximo publice ac solemnibus supplicationibus gratias egimus agique fecimus, M^{tem} ejus humiliter deprecantes, ut suos ac vestros hostes fidei catholicae et sacro imperio rebelles ad sanitatem atque obedientiam plene reducere vobis concedat, ad tranquillitatem istius inclytæ nationis Germanicæ bonumque commune totius christianitatis et assertionem fidei sancte suæ.

Datum Romæ etc. 20. maii 1547 anno 13. Blos.

[A tergo:] Regi Romanorum ad suas [litteras] super victoria contra duces Saxoniae.

[Concept. Arm. 41, t. 39, n. 475. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

35. CARDINAL MORONE TO CARDINAL MADRUZZO.¹

1548, Januar. 23, Bologna.

He would have liked to have been in Rome in order to have helped him : di metter acqua et spegner quanto può il foco. Io non son anco fuor di speranza in tutto che forse col mezzo d' una suspensione di questo benedetto concilio di consenso di l' uno et l' altro di questi doi principi : a reconciliation might result.

[Autograph P. S. :] Il rev^{mo} s. Croce tornò heri sera da Roma et trovò la protesta già fatta dal sig. fiscale in nome di S. M^{ta}. Io non so che partito si pigliarino, ma a questi sig^{ri} prelati pare che saria stato conveniente che S. M^{ta} avesse risposto alle condizioni ch' erano ricercate per deliberare del ritorno del concilio in Trento di che non essendovi parola stimano che S. M^{ta} non sia informata bene de tutti li andamenti et lo dicono ; nondimeno a me non quadra ; esso fiscale non è tornato alla congregatione per la risposta già offerta dal rev^{mo} di Monte et dal resto della congregatione per venerdì passato. Io per tutti li rispetti come V. S. R^{ma} et Ill. può pensar sto di mala voglia et prego Dio vi ponghi la mano et mi par cosa troppo horribile a pensar li disordini che veneriano in christianità, quando si facesse rottura tra questi doi

¹ See *supra*, p. 404.

principi, nel che confido che la bontà di S. M. et gran prudentia haverà molta consideratione perchè si potria cominciar tal danza che non si finiria nè alli giorni nostri nè ad una altra età de posterì, come si è veduto alias nelli altri schisma et il cominciar pare facile, il finire non è in potestà delli homini.

[Orig. Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck.]

36. POPE PAUL III. TO ANTONINO SIRLETO.¹

1548, April 14, Rom.

Dilecto filio Antonino Sirleto canonico ecclesiae Jeracensis.²
 Dilecte fili salutem. Intelleximus esse nonnulla diversorum ordinum monasteria in diocesibus Reginensi, Jeracensi, Oppidensi ac Miletensi consistentia, in quibus bibliothecae sunt multis libris ac voluminibus tam Latinorum quam Graecorum auctorum refertae ac plenae;³ cupientes autem ob bonas rationes dictorum librorum et voluminum notulam seu indicem habere, de tua diligentia confisi tibi, qui, sicut accepimus, etiam venerabilis fratris episcopi Jeracensis in spiritualibus vicarius generalis existis, per praesentes committimus, ut ad dicta monasteria te personaliter conferas dictorumque monasteriorum abbates et superiores ex parte nostra requiras, ut te cum uno aut altero socio dictas bibliothecas ingredi ad hunc effectum libere permittant, et librorum ac voluminum, que in illis reperies, notulam seu indicem conficias et ad nos transmittas, quid in qualibet bibliotheca sit, particulariter annotando, ac contradictores per censuras ecclesiasticas eadem auctoritate nostra compescendo, invocato etiam ad id si opus fuerit auxilio brachii saecularis. Non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis ac dictorum monasteriorum et ordinum etiam iuramento confirmatione apostolica vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis statutis et consuetudinibus, privilegiis quoque indultis ac litteris apostolicis eisdem monasteriis et ordinibus concessis,

¹ See *supra*, p. 547.

² Gerace.

³ Here is a marginal remark : et eorum praesertim, quae ad sacri oecumenici concilii celebrationem pertinent (pertinent over the erased : multum prodesse) : see below : et quoniam inter ipsa volumina aliqua esse possent, quae facerent ad sacri oecumenici concilii celebrationem ; all struck through.

confirmatis et innovatis ceterisque contrariis quibuscunque. Volumus preterea quod si que sint in ipsis ecclesiis Reginensi, Jeracensi, Oppidensi et Miletensi bibliothecae, idem de libris in illis existentibus requisitis locorum ordinariis facias.

Dat. Romae XIII. aprilis 1548 a° 14.

Blos.

[Concept. Arm. 41, t. 41, n. 210. Secret Archives of the Vatican.]

37. A. CATTANEO TO CARDINAL MADRUZZO.¹

1548, December 29, Rome.

. . . Ai XXIV che fu la vigilia di Natale arrivò il s. Giulio Orsino a Roma il quale senza havere cosa alcuna in scritto ha portato tanto buone parole e larghe promesse havute da S. M. come da mons. Granvela che è quasi meraviglia a se si adempissero in parte. Credo ch'el papa ne restaria sodisfatissimo. . . . Hora questi signori sono sopra il fare resolutione delle cose o più tosto parole portate dal s. Giulio et hoggi ancora al tardi si è fatta una radunanza dei consiglieri innanzi al papa et secondo questa resolutione si risolveranno le istruzioni et indirizzi che si hanno di dare al duca Ottavio, il quale fra doi o tre dì si ha di partire.

[Orig. Vice-regal Archives, Innsbruck.]

38. BENEDETTO BUONANNI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF TUSCANY.²

1549, Juni 29, Rom.

Col poco tempo che me ne fu dato scrissi due hore sono alla S. V. per via d' un corriere che fu espedito a Genova, com' era passata la cerimonia del censo di Napoli, nella quale non lasserò ancora di dire alla S. V. con la presente, come non solamente è stato biasimato il sig^{or} Don Diego d' havere fatta comprare una chinea che 13 anni sono fu data da S. Santità alla sig^a Francesca S^{ta} Fiore bo. me. quando fu maritata nel s^{or} Hier^{mo} Orsino, di piccol prezzo, stata altra volta presentata et con guarnimenti men ricchi del solito, ma d' essersene riso con molti, sotto colore di gratia et di piacevolezza. Il che quanto sia conforme alla mente di Sua S^{ta}, che preme infinitamente in vedere che si tenghino nel grado

¹ See *supra*, p. 442.

² See *supra*, p. 445.

che si deve le cose di questa sede, per se stessa se lo imaginerà la S. V. Restò S. S^{ta} in molta colera, quando uscendo della porta di San Pietro non trovò li il s^{or} Don Diego secondi il solito. Ma se le crebbe maggiore, quando giunta alle stanze sue per mettersi a tavola le fu fatto intendere ch' egli non haveva voluto consegnare il censo al car^{al} Camarlingo, il che dicono che s' era fatto a tempo d' altri pontefici, et si poteva fare adesso senza alcun pregiudizio di S. M^{ta}, ma ch' era risoluto di voler darlo a S. S^{ta} medesima. D' onde ne successe [che con poca dignità del carico suo stette fuor di tutte le sale in un luogo strettissimo]¹ aspettando che S. S^{ta} avesse magnato, la quale benchè lo sapesse, non per questo si vedde che accelerasse più del solito il fine del suo magnare. Fu chiamato poi dentro da m. Eurialo cam^{re} di S. S^{ta} [et nel muoversi Don Diego si messe a dirli, per quanto ho inteso che poi che S. S^{ta} haveva desinato poteva ancor dormire un poco per non uscire del' ordin suo ch' egli aspeterebbe].² Il che fu dato a tristo senso, et ch' egli lo dicesse ironicamente come non harebbe a credersi . . .

Nella secreteria di S. S^{ta} si non divise le provincie per conto dei negotii: a mons. Dandino tocca quella della corte cesarea, havendoli dato per substituto m. Annibale Caro, et al Cavalcante è tocca quella di Francia con un substituto che si domanda m. Seb. Gualterio già secret. del card. Trivultii. A mons. di Pola tocca quasi vedere il tutti . . .

[Orig. State Archives, Florence, Med. 3268, f. 219.]

39. UBERTO STROZZI TO THE CARDINAL ERCOLE GONZAGA.³

1549, November 7, Rom.

. . . Heri a 18 hore essendo il r^{mo} Farnese a Monte cavallo, ove S. S^{ta} sta adesso, per raggiunarli delle cose del duca Ottavio, dal quale era venuta la staffetta la notte inanti, et havendoli mostrata la sua lattera, nella quale pareva che risolvesse non volere tornare a Roma nè altrove, dove ella comandasse, se non se li dava Parma overo la ricompensa et quasi protestava se non se pigliava risoluzione di cercare per altra via di accommodare le cose sue,

¹ In cipher.

² In cipher.

³ See *supra*, p. 451.

con molti altri particolari, S. S^{ta}, o per la colera o per il freddo preso la mattina per condursi lì, como molti vogliono, hebbe tanta alteratione che subito se li voltò il stomacho et con vomito li pigliò un accidente con ingrossarsegli la lingua, tanto grande che fece paura a tutti i soi, maxime che subito li pigliò la febre, la quale per quanto intendo non l'ha ancora lassato, anzi questa notte il catarro li ha dato fastidio, con lutto che dicano che pur habbi dormito et riposato . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

40. CARDINAL ALESSANDRO FARNESE TO CAMILLO ORSINI.¹

1549, November 8, [Rom].

Ritrovandosi la S^{ta} di N^{ro} S^{re} molto grave e cognoscendo il pericolo della vita sua, nel quale si ritrova, si è risoluto di spedire un breve diretto a V. S. I. poichè non può scrivere di sua mano et invece di ciò ha commesso a me che per parte sua le scriva, come fo colla presente in conformità di esso breve, che debba consegnare all' ill^o et ecc^o sig. duca Ottavio la città di Parma con la cittadella subito che intenda che S. S^{ta} sia mancata (il che Dio per sua misericordia prolunghi a molti anni) non ostante qualsivoglia altra commissione che sopra ciò havesse data a V. S. I., come più a pieno potrà intendere dal r. vescovo di Pola, secretario di S. S^{ta}, al quale potrà dar fede come alla persona propria di S. B^{ne}.

[Copy. Altieri Library, Rome, VII., E-IV., f. 104.]

¹ See *supra*, p. 452.

INDEX OF NAMES IN VOL. XII.

- ABBACO, Antonio (architect),
 553 n. 3.
 Abdelmem (governor of Mount
 Lebanon), 521 n.
 Accolti, Benedetto, Cardinal
 (of Ravenna), 183 n. 1, 284,
 385 n., 503 n. 3.
 Accoramboni, Girolamo (doctor
 of medicine), 526.
 Achilles (S.J.), 59 n. 4.
 Adjutorio, Desiderio d' (canon),
 601.
 Adrian VI., Pope, 18, 19, 102,
 655.
 Adriani, Adriano (S.J.), 91 n. 1,
 110.
 ,, G. B. (historian), 174
 n. 4.
 Agnello, Giovanni, 460 n. 2.
 Agostino Piemontese, Fra (Aug-
 ustinian), 28.
 Agricola, Johann (Protestant
 theologian, court preacher
 to the Elector of Branden-
 burg), 413.
 Aguilar, Marquis of (Imperial
 ambassador in Rome), 148,
 158 *seq.*, 185.
 Alaba, Didascus de (Bishop of
 Astorja), 250, 253.
 Alba, Duke of, 365.
 Albani, Giovanni Girolamo
 (canonist), 541.
 Albert of Brandenburg, Cardinal
 (Elector of May-
 ence, Archbishop
 of Magdeburg, and
 Albert of Brandenburg—*contd.*
 Administrator of
 Halle), 104, 128,
 135 n. 1, 139, 141,
 165, 167, 179, 181
 n. 7, 275.
 ,, ,, (Grand-Master of the
 Teutonic Order),
 488.
 ,, ,, the Margrave, 292.
 ,, ,, Margrave of Branden-
 burg-Culmbach,
 293, 302, 357 *seq.*,
 427.
 Albret, Jeanne d', 521 n. 5.
 Albuquerque, Juan de (Fran-
 ciscan, Bishop of Goa), 114.
 Albus, Paul (sculptor), 594 n. 2.
 Alciati, Andrea (jurist), 544.
 Aldovrandi, Ulysses, 595.
 Aldus Manutius (typographer),
 547 *seq.*
 Aleander, Hieronymus, Car-
 dinal (Archbishop of
 Brindisi), 125, 131, 468 n.
 2, 541, 545, 659.
 Alepo, Salvatore (Archbishop
 of Sassari), 261, 269.
 Alessi, Galeazzo (architect), 553
 n. 3.
 ,, Niccolò (theologian),
 540 n. 2.
 Alexander VI., Pope, 1, 98 n. 2,
 557, 578 n. 2, 592.
 Alfani, Alfano (mathematician),
 537.
 Alfonso (King of Congo), 514.

- Alterius, Martius (poet), 594 n. 1.
 Altoviti, Bindo (Papal depositary), 603, 635 n. 4, 636.
 Alvarez (S.J.), 94.
 „ de Toledo, Juan, Cardinal (Dominican, Archbishop of Burgos), 45, 186, 231, 355, 407, 420.
 Amaseo, Romolo (humanist), 528 *seq.*, 557.
 Amatori, Francesco (assistant to Michael Angelo), 609, 615.
 Amboise, Georges d', Cardinal, 243 n. 1.
 Amerbach, V. (humanist), 279 n. 1.
 Ammanati (sculptor), 594.
 Anastasius (Emperor), 197.
 Andelot, Johann von (Imperial high steward), 227 *seq.*, 230, 234.
 Andersson, Lorenz (Swedish reformer), 477.
 Andreassi, Giorgio (Bishop of Chiusi), 129 n.
 Angelico da Fiesole, B. (Dominican, painter), 574, 628.
 Angelinus, P. (Bishop of Nepi), 591 n. 8.
 Angero (a Japanese convert), 120.
 Anguissola, Giovanni, Count, 372.
 Annebaut, Jacques d', Cardinal, 202 n. 1.
 Antella, Giovanni dell' (Florentine envoy), 47 n. 2, 128 n. 2, 367, 587 n. 9, 658.
 Aquaviva, Claudius (S.J.), 14 n. 2.
 Aracintio, Rodolfo (poet), 532.
 Aragon, Johannes of (S.J.), 99.
 „ Sebastiano de (Bishop of Patti, Inquisitor for Sicily), 90.
 Araoz, Antonio (S.J.), 39 n. 1, 43 n. 5, 51 n. 2, 53 n. 1, 83, 91 *seq.*
 Archinto, Filippo (Papal vicar-general, Bishop of Borgo S. Sepolcro), 45, 51 n. 3, 53 n. 1, 81, 509 n. 1, 525, 655.
 Ardinghello, Giuliano, Cardinal, 361, 366, 418, 420.
 „ Niccolò (secretary), Cardinal, 53, 128 n. 1, 133, 147, 187, 202 n. 1, 232 n., 541, 661.
 Aresson, Jon (Bishop of Holar, Iceland), 481 *seq.*
 Aretino, Pietro, 535, 613, 615 *seqq.*, 675.
 Argulus, Joannes Gasparus (commissary), 589 n. 4.
 Ariosto, 523.
 Aristotle, 72.
 Armagnac, Georges d', Cardinal (Bishop of Rodez), 202 n. 1, 208, 231.
 Armellini, Francesco, Cardinal, 557.
 Arran, Earl of (Regent of Scotland), 472.
 Astemio, Vincenzo (poet), 533.
 Atanagi, Dionisio, 539 n. 1.
 Aubespine (secretary to King Henry II. of France), 435.
 Augustine, St. (of England), 469.
 Augustini, Raffaello (of Fivizzano), 89.
 Augustinus de Aretio (General of the Servites), 749 n. 2.
 Augustus, Duke of Saxony, 275.
 Aurelian, 556, 558, 580.
 Avalos, Alfonso d', *see* Vasto, Marquis del.
 „ Gasparo d' (of Compostela), Cardinal, 202.

- BABBI, Francesco, 191 n. 1, 285, 560 n. 4.
- Baccio Bigio, Nanni di (sculptor), 594, 643.
- Badia, Tommaso (Master of the Sacred Palace, Cardinal), 33, 397, 505, 541.
- Baglioni, Astorre (Roman senator), 452, 533.
- „ Rodolfo, 385.
- Balamius, Ferdinand (physician), 537 n. 3.
- Baldovinetto (Bishop of Ancona), 586 n. 1.
- Balducci, Giacomo (goldsmith), 598.
- Balduini, Balduino (physician), 351, 353.
- Banda, Antonio della (wood-carver), 602.
- Bandinelli (sculptor), 594, 616.
- „ Ubaldini (Bishop of Montefiascone and Corneto), 537.
- Bandini, Francesco (Archbishop of Siena), Cardinal, 34, 304.
- Barbaran, Valentino, Fra, 49, 50 n. 1.
- Barletta, Leonardo da (humanist), *see* Leonardo.
- Baronino da Casale, Bartolommeo (architect), 553 n. 3, 565.
- Bartoli, Daniello (S.J.), 3 n.
- Basil, St., 67.
- Beaton, David, Cardinal (Archbishop of St. Andrews), 469, 471-473, 668.
- Beccadelli, Lodovico, 235 n., 529.
- Bellagais (secretary), 220.
- Bellay, Jean du (Bishop of Paris, Cardinal), 333, 386, 407, 420, 442 *seq.*, 446, 462 n. 2.
- Belli, Valerio (goldsmith), 127 n. 1, 600.
- Belmesseri, Paolo (lecturer in medicine), 528.
- Bembo, Pietro, Cardinal, 530, 538, 541, 605.
- Benedetto da Mantua (Augustinian), 496.
- Benedict, St., 68 n. 1.
- Bermudez, Juan (cleric), 113, 514 n. 1.
- Bernal, Joannes [Diego de Lugo], Bishop of Calahorra, 449.
- Bernard, St., 16.
- Bernardi, Antonio (philosopher) 529.
- „ Giovanni, da Castel Bolognese (goldsmith), 598.
- Berse, Gaspar (S.J.), 117 n. 3, 119, 121 n. 1.
- Bertano, Gurone (envoy), 324, 330.
- „ Pietro (Bishop of Fano), 234 n. 4, 308, 311, 398 n. 1, 432 *seq.*, 436 *seq.*, 440, 442, 444 *seq.*, 448.
- Bianchetto, Giovanni (official of the Secretary of Briefs), 468 n. 2, 493 n. 4.
- Bibra, Conrad von (Bishop of Würzburg), 168.
- Billick, Eberhard (Carmelite), 279 *seq.*, 413.
- Bladus, Antonius Asulanus (printer), 530 n. 5, 547.
- Blosius, Ludovicus (O.S.B.), 18.
- Bobadilla, Nicolas (S.J.), 22, 84, 104, 108 *seq.*, 134, 417.
- Boleyn, Anne, 463.
- Bona (Queen of Poland), 489.
- Bonaventure, St., 16.
- Boncompagni, Ugo (afterwards Pope Gregory XIII.), 248.
- Boniface VIII., Pope, 588.

- Bonuccio, Agostino (General of the Servites), 243, 261.
- Bonzagni, Giovanni Giacomo (goldsmith), 599.
- Borghasio, Paolo (canonist), 541.
- Borghesi, Antonio, 238 n. 1.
- Borgia, Francis, St. (afterwards General of the Jesuits), 2 n., 17, 38, 96 *seqq.*
- „ Girolamo (Bishop of Massalubrense), 533, 550 n. 3, 584 n., 613 n. 3.
- „ Juan III., Duke of Gandia (father of St. Francis Borgia), 96.
- Borromeo, Charles, St., 18, 617.
- Bourbon, Charles de (The Constable), 385, 555.
- „ „ Cardinal, 368 n.
- Bradine, Lucrezia, 52, 53 n. 1.
- Bramante (architect), 573, 606, 635, 640 *seqq.*, 645 *seqq.*
- Braun, Conrad (jurist), 167.
- Brenz, Johann (Protestant theologian), 279.
- Brian (English envoy), 466 n. 5.
- Brionäus, Martin, 548 n. 6.
- Broët, Pascal (S.J.), 22, 34, 84, 100.
- Bucer, Martin, 105 *seq.*, 205 *seq.*, 279 *seq.*, 342.
- Bugenhagen, Johann (Protestant theologian), 479.
- Buonanni, Benedetto (Florentine envoy), 442 n., 443 n., 445 n. 2, 579 n. 3, 681.
- Buoncambi (agent of Pier Luigi Farnese), 283.
- Burlamachi (chronicler), 385 n.
- Busäus, 104 n. 2.
- CACCIA, del (Florentine envoy in Rome), 285.
- Cafarelli, Gian Pietro (architect), 568 n. 1, 570.
- Cajetan, Thomas de Vio, Cardinal, 342.
- Callini, Bernardino (Bishop of Segni), 591 n. 8.
- Calvin, John [anonym: Eusebius Pamphili], 216 n. 2, 342, 487, 492, 500.
- Camerino, Paolo da (S.J.), 121 n. 1.
- Campeggio, Giovanni Battista (Bishop of Majorca), 219 n. 4.
- „ Lorenzo, Cardinal, 536 n. 4, 541.
- „ Tommaso (Bishop of Feltre), 154, 166, 171 n. 1, 178, 212, 219 n. 5, 242 *seq.*, 245, 252, 541.
- Camutius, Andreas (theologian), 540.
- Cancellieri, Angelo del Bufalo de' (overseer of Roman streets), 565.
- Canisius, Peter, St. (S.J.), 17, 56, 78 n. 5, 80, 82, 90 *seq.*, 104, 105 n. 1, 109-112.
- Cano, Melchior (Dominican), 94 *seq.*
- Capilupi, Camillo, 306, 677.
- Capitaneis, Lodovico de (goldsmith), 598.
- Capodiferro, Girolamo, Cardinal, 46 n. 2, 133 n. 3, 145 n. 3, 170 n., 202 n. 1, 335, 474.
- Capua, Pietro Antonio da (Archbishop of Otranto), 167, 179 *seq.*
- Caracalla, 558, 580.
- Caracciolo, Marino, Cardinal, 503 n. 3.

- Carafa, Gian Pietro, Cardinal (Bishop of Chieti, Archbishop of Naples, and later Pope Paul IV.), 24, 45, 55, 144 n. 3, 195, 209, 231, 233, 420, 452 n. 2, 504 *seq.*, 507 *seq.*, 510, 543, 584 n. 1, 659.
- „ Oliviero, Cardinal, 451, 654 n. 9.
- „ Vincenzo, Cardinal, 27, 29.
- Carnesecchi, Pietro (humanist), 508.
- Caro, Annibale (secretary), 454, 531, 539, 593, 600, 682.
- Carpi, *see* Pio.
- Casa, Claudio della (notary), 401.
- „ Giovanni della (nuncio), 513, 525.
- Casale, Francesco, 463 n. 5.
- „ Pier Antonio, 576.
- Casas, Bartolomé de las (Bishop of Chiapa), 518.
- Caselli (Dominican, Bishop of Bertinoro), 178, 219 n. 4, 265.
- Castagna, Francesco (Papal commissary), 590 n. 5.
- Castelalto, Francesco de (orator), 212.
- Castiglione, Francesco Romeo de (General of the Dominicans), 429 n. 2.
- Castilla, Alfonso de, 449.
- Castriotto, Jacopo Fusti (architect), 562 *seq.*
- Castro, Scipio da, 371 n. 2.
- Catarino, Ambrogio (Dominican, Bishop of Minori), 84, 111, 243, 254, 429, 500 *seq.*
- Catherine of Aragon (wife of Henry VIII.), 463.
- Cattaneo, Aurelio (secretary to Cardinal Madruzzo), 290, 309, 311, 442, 681.
- Cauco, Giacomo (Archbishop of Corfù), 167, 304, 307, 350.
- Cavalcanti, Bartolommeo, 538, 682.
- Cavalli, Marino (Venetian ambassador), 486.
- Cellini, Benvenuto, 538, 589, 598 *seq.*, 600.
- Cervini, Marcello, Cardinal, (Bishop of Nicastro, afterwards Pope Marcellus II.), 44 n. 4, 79, 81, 84, 101 n. 1, 126, 162, 171 n. 1, 174, 209 *seqq.*, 240, 242, 247, 257 n. 1, 305 *seq.*, 309, 310 n. 3, 311, 316 n. 4, 317, 341 *seq.*, 346, 348, 354, 374, 396, 404, 431, 436, 437 n. 2, 471, 478 n. 2, 504 n., 505 n., 531, 541, 545, 547.
- Cesati, Alessandro [Il Grechetto], 232, 599, 600.
- Cesi, Federigo, Cardinal, 202 n. 1, 541, 585, 595.
- Chaireddin Barbarossa, 183, 386.
- Chantonnay, Thomas de (younger son of the chancellor, Granvelle), 159, 171.
- Charles V. (The Emperor), 28, 46, 96, 102, 106, 108 *seq.*, 124-133, 140, 146-152, 155, 158, 160, 168, 170-178, 180, 182-202, 206 *seqq.*, 213 *seq.*, 217, 219, 222-230, 233-237, 249 *seq.*, 255-258, 261, 266, 271-284, 286 *seqq.*, 289-298, 300-303, 305-319, 321-339, 347 *seq.*, 351, 356-365, 367-374, 375-

- Charles V.—*continued*.
 382, 384-408, 409-428,
 430, 432-437, 439-442,
 444-449, 461, 463, 465,
 469 *seqq.*, 474, 478, 485
seq., 495, 519, 535, 538,
 564, 566, 569, 597 n. 2,
 605, 636 *seq.*
- Charles, Duke of Savoy, 103,
 128.
- Cherubino (clock maker), 600.
- Christian II. (King of Den-
 mark), 478, 481.
- „ III., (King of Den-
 mark), 479, 482.
- Christopher of Brunswick (Arch-
 bishop of Bremen), 181
 n. 7.
- Cibo, Caterina (Duchess of
 Camerino), 398 n.
- „ Giulio, 386.
- „ Innocenzo, Cardinal, 183
 n. 1.
- Cipriano (Dominican, canonist),
 540.
- Cisneros, Garcia de (Abbot of
 Montserrat), 16.
- Clario, Isidoro (Bishop of Fol-
 igno), 80, 89, 539, 544.
- Clement VII., Pope, 46, 173,
 188, 333, 383 *seq.*,
 456, 477, 483, 495,
 517, 524, 539, 547,
 549, 551, 554, 556,
 586 n. 1, 588 *seq.*,
 594 *seq.*, 599, 608,
 635, 651 *seq.*, 655.
- „ VIII., Pope, 618 n. 2.
- „ XIII., Pope, 619.
- Clementis, Pietro Francesco
 (architect), 590 n. 5.
- Clovio, Giulio (miniaturist),
 608.
- Cochläus, Joannes, 18, 103, 279.
- Codacio, Pietro (S.J.), 38 *seq.*,
 42.
- Codure, Jean (S.J.), 22, 36, 58.
- Coelho, Gaspar (Vicar in Melia-
 pur), 117.
- Colle, Giuliano da, 509 n. 1.
- Colocci, Angelo (Bishop of
 Nocera), 532.
- Colonna, Family of the, 283,
 383, 539, 555.
- „ Ascanio, 175, 188,
 194 n. 2, 284, 385,
 670.
- „ Vittoria (Duchess of
 Amalfi), 25, 497,
 635.
- Condivi (biographer of Michael
 Angelo), 551, 611, 627 n. 2.
- Contarini, Gasparo, Cardinal,
 27, 30, 32 *seq.*,
 36, 106, 126, 131,
 135, 144 n. 3,
 149, 155, 342,
 468, 498, 502
seq., 541, 605,
 664 *seq.*
- „ Giulio (Bishop of
 Belluno), 85.
- „ Pietro, 23, 30 n. 1.
- Conversini, Benedetto (Bishop
 of Bertinoro), 30.
- Copernicus, Nicolas, 549 *seq.*
- Copetta, Francesco (poet), 533.
- Cornaro [Corner], Andrea, Car-
 dinal (Archbishop
 of Spalato), 202 n.
 1, 346, 659.
- „ Francesco, Cardinal
 (Bishop of Brescia),
 614.
- Cortese, Gregorio, Cardinal (re-
 former of the Cassinese
 Benedictines), 209, 541,
 543.
- Covos, Francesco, 636 n. 3.
- Cranmer, Thomas, 476.
- Crescenzi, Marcello, Cardinal
 (Bishop of Marsico), 41,
 50, 209, 361, 366, 368,
 397, 407.

- Criminali, Antonio (S.J.), 118.
 Crispi, Tiberio, Cardinal, 202
 n. 1, 578 *seq.*, 587 n. 11.
 Cromwell, Thomas, 457, 470.
 Crusius (S.J.), 103 n. 1.
 Cruyllas, Francesca, 52 *seqq.*
 Cueva, Bartolomé de la, Cardinal,
 45, 202, 420.
 Cupis, Domenico de, Cardinal
 (Bishop of Camerino), 209,
 231, 420, 592 n. 2.
 Curione, Celio Secondo (Italian
 heretic), 500.
 Cyprian (S.J.), 118 n. 6.
 Cyril of Alexandria, 110.
- DANDINO, Girolamo (secretary
 to Paul III., Bishop of
 Caserta and Imola), 124
 n. 1, 127, 128 n. 1, 133
 n. 3, 170 n., 187 n. 1, 208,
 224, 235-238, 256 n. 7,
 257 n. 1, 274, 296 n. 1,
 333, 431, 682.
 Dandolo, Matteo (Venetian
 envoy), 445 n. 2, 451 n. 3.
 Danès, Pierre (French envoy to
 Trent), 270.
 Dante, 626 *seq.*
 Dantiscus, Joannes, 489 n. 4.
 David (King of Ethiopia), 514.
 Dentocambi, Clementi (en-
 gineer), 602.
 Diana of Poitiers (natural
 daughter of Henry II. of
 France), 367 n. 2, 432,
 449.
 Diaz, Giambernardo (Bishop of
 Calahorra), 447.
 Diethelm (Abbot of St. Gall),
 163.
 Dionysius (Guardian of the
 Convent of Sion at Jeru-
 salem), 666.
 Doctis, Gasparo de (auditor),
 23.
 Dolce, Lodovico, 617.
- Doménech, Jerónimo (S.J.),
 41 n. 3, 42 n. 2, 89, 100
 n. 1.
 Domenichi, L., 611 n. 3.
 Dominic, St., 5.
 Doria, Andrea (Admiral), 332,
 371, 600.
 Dosio, Giovanni Antonio (sculp-
 tor), 594.
 Duca, Giacomo del (architect),
 573.
 Duisnio, Alberto (Dominican,
 canonist), 540.
 Du Mortier (French ambas-
 sador), 334 n. 5, 383.
 Dunbar, Gavin (Archbishop of
 Glasgow), 100.
 Du Prat, Guillaume (Bishop of
 Clermont), 82, 249.
 Duranti, Durante de', Cardinal
 (Bishop of Alghero), 202
 n. 1, 509 n. 1.
 Dzierzgowski (Polish Bishop),
 489 n. 4.
- ECK, Johann, 111.
 „ Leonhard von (Bavarian
 chancellor), 293, 416
seq.
 Edward VI. (King of England),
 472, 474, 476.
 Egidio, Fra (Carmelite, pro-
 fessor in the Roman Uni-
 versity), 540.
 Egmont, Maximilian (Count of
 Büren), 297, 334.
 Einarsson Gisfur (Bishop of
 Skalholt), 481.
 Eleanora (Duchess of Florence),
 81, 87.
 Elio, Antonio (secretary to
 Cardinal Farnese, Bishop
 of Pola), 318, 452 n. 4.
 Engelbertson, Olaf (Archbishop
 of Drontheim), 481.
 Enriquez, Enrique (S.J.), 118 n.
 6, 121 n.

- Enzinas, Jayme (Spanish heretic), 508.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 413, 495, 542.
- Ercole II. (Duke of Ferrara).
26, 30, 86, 126,
194, 233, 354 n.
2, 446, 672-675.
,, the wife of, *see*
Renée.
- Ernest of Bavaria, Duke (Bishop of Passau, Archbishop of Salzburg), 107, 157, 181.
- d' Este, Ippolito, Cardinal, 193, 194, 446, 452 n. 2, 599, 669.
- Estrada (S.J.), 95.
- Eustathios (commentator on Homer, 548.
- FABER [Le Fèvre], Peter (S.J.),
21, 26, 31, 34, 42, 52
n. 1, 79, 91, 96, 98
n. 3, 99, 102-106,
109, 116, 134, 527.
,, Johann (Bishop of Vienna), 478 n. 1, 548 n. 5.
- Farnese, Family of the, 187 n.,
191, 283, 334, 422,
534.
,, Alessandro, Cardinal (afterwards Paul III.), 523.
,, Alessandro, Cardinal (son of Pier Luigi *the younger*), 40, 48, 49 n. 1, 52, 89, 108, 126, 131, 137 n. 1, 139, 149 n., 153, 155, 157, 162, 166 *seq.*, 172 *seq.*, 185, 187-192, 193, 196, 198, 209 n. 2, 212 n. 4, 217-226, 228, 230, 234 n. 4, 236, 238, 243 n. 1,
- Farnese, Alessandro—*continued.*
246, 252 *seq.*, 257 n.,
262 *seq.*, 266, 273,
286 *seq.*, 291 *seq.*,
297 n. 3, 302, 304
seqq., 308, 310-319,
324, 329, 337 *seqq.*,
347, 351, 354, 356,
361 *seqq.*, 366, 368
seq., 373, 380 *seq.*,
395, 399 n. 1, 401
n. 1, 418, 421, 429,
433 *seq.*, 440, 442,
450 *seqq.*, 454, 505
n. 1, 527 *seqq.*, 531,
533, 537, 565, 582
n. 1, 593, 598, 600,
603, 605, 607, 614,
659, 661, 664, 670,
673, 676, 682 *seq.*
,, Alessandro (son of Ottavio), 231 n. 4.
,, Costanza (daughter of Alessandro, afterwards Cardinal, and Pope Paul III., married to Bosio Sforza, Count of Santa Fiora), 202 n. 1.
,, Edoardo, Cardinal, 455.
,, Giulia (daughter of Pier Luigi *the elder*), 455.
,, Margaret (natural daughter of Charles V., wife of Ottavio Farnese), *see* Margaret of Austria.
,, Orazio (son of Pier Luigi *the younger*), 232, 367 n. 2, 432, 435, 449, 529.
,, Ottavio (son of Pier Luigi *the younger*), 42, 52, 126, 128

- Farnese, Ottavio—*continued.*
seq., 176, 182, 188,
 192, 229 *seq.*, 232
seq., 292, 296, 321,
 372 *seq.*, 377 *seq.*,
 382, 433, 435, 444,
 449-453, 563, 600,
 658, 670 *seq.*, 676,
 681, 682 *seq.*
 „ Pier Luigi *the younger*
 (son of Alessandro,
 afterwards Cardinal,
 and Pope Paul III.),
 172, 176 *seq.*, 191
seq., 229 *seq.*, 232
seq., 283, 290, 320-
 323, 362, 369-373,
 376, 381, 383 *seq.*,
 394, 529, 531, 535,
 555, 557, 563, 580
 n. 1, 587 n. 9. 589
 n. 4, 592 *seq.*, 599
seq.
 „ Ranuccio, Cardinal
 (Archbishop of
 Naples, son of Pier
 Luigi *the younger*),
 243 n. 1, 529.
 „ Vittoria (daughter of
 Pier Luigi *the*
younger), 175, 191
seq., 283, 367 n. 2,
 530 n. 4, 670.
 Faure, J. B., (S.J.), 504 n. 3.
 Favorino, Varino (Bishop of
 Nocera), 532.
 Felice, Fra (of Mount Lebanon),
 521 n., 666.
 Ferdinand I. (brother to Charles
 V.), King of
 Hungary and Bo-
 hemia, 55, 107,
 128, 137-143, 146,
 158, 162-166, 171
seq., 178, 184, 199
seq., 212 *seq.*, 214,
 220 *seq.*, 227, 242,
- Ferdinand I.—*continued.*
 255, 270-274, 286
 288, 294, 357 *seq.*,
 361, 387 n. 2, 410,
 420, 422, 437, 439,
 443, 678.
 „ II. (the Catholic),
 King of Aragon,
 4, 335.
 Ferreri, Bonifazio (Cardinal of
 Ivrea, nuncio), 244
seq.
 „ Filiberto, Cardinal,
 443.
 Ferretti, J. F., 579 n. 2, 583
 n. 2.
 Ferri, Alfonso (surgeon), 528.
 Ferron, Bartolomé (S.J.), 43 n.
 1, 53 n. 1, 54 n. 1, 56 n. 1,
 83 n. 2, 108 n. 2.
 Fichard (jurist), 555.
 Fiesco, 332, 369, 371, 386.
 Figueroa (officer of the Imperial
 household), 236, 378, 382.
 Filareto, Appolonio (secretary to
 Pier Luigi Farnese), 229.
 Filheul, Antoine (Archbishop
 of Aix), 242, 244, 251.
 Filonardi, Ennio, Cardinal, 34.
 Fine, Cornelius de, 127 n. 2.
 Fisher, John, B. (Bishop of
 Rochester and Cardinal),
 458 *seq.*, 541.
 Flaminio, Marcantonio (human-
 ist), 247, 496, 498, 530,
 533.
 Flavius, F., 532 n. 6.
 Flersheim, Philipp von (Bishop
 of Spire), 103, 138.
 Fonseca, Juan (Bishop of Cas-
 tellamare), 248.
 Fontana (architect), 3 n. 1.
 Fonzio, Bartolommeo (O.S.F.),
 492 n. 2.
 Foscarari, Egidio (Master of
 the Sacred Palace), 540
 n. 2.

- Foscheri, Pietro (Podestà of Trent), 354 n. 2.
- Fracastoro, Girolamo (physician), 351, 353, 531, 536.
- Fracco, Novidio (poet), 533, 535 *seq.*
- Franchino, F., 452 n. 2.
- Francis I. (King of France), 28, 102, 124, 127 *seq.*, 133, 137 n. 1, 139 n. 4, 145, 147-152, 155, 168, 172, 175, 177, 182, 183-186, 191, 193 *seqq.*, 198 *seqq.*, 207 *seq.*, 209 n. 2, 220, 244, 249, 255, 270 *seq.*, 301, 315, 320, 323 *seq.*, 335, 360, 459, 461, 465, 467 *seqq.*, 472, 474, 482-487, 535, 599, 602, 605, 636 *seq.*, 653, 662.
- Francis, Duke of Orleans (afterwards Francis II., King of France), 191, 670.
- Francis of Assisi, St., 5, 67, 622 n.
- „ of Sales, St., 18.
- „ Xavier, St. (S.J.), 22 *seqq.*, 36 n. 2, 42 nn., 44 n. 4, 98, 114-122, 518.
- Franco, Niccolò (satirist), 535.
- Frangipani, Antonino, 27.
- Frederick II., the Emperor, 197.
- „ I. (King of Denmark), 479.
- „ (Count Palatine of the Rhine), 275, 326, 478.
- „ (Duke of Saxony), 200 n. 4.
- Fregoso (French diplomatist), 127.
- „ Federigo, Cardinal, (Bishop of Gubbio, Archbishop of Salerno), 541, 543.
- Fruntsberg, Melchior, 385.
- GABRIELLI, Scipione, 446 n. 2, 452 n. 1, 632 n.
- Gaetano di Tiene, S., 55.
- Galatinus, Petrus (Minorite), 540.
- Galeotto, Pietro Paolo (goldsmith), 599.
- Gambara, Uberto, Cardinal (Bishop of Tortona), 126, 230.
- „ Veronica, 174 n. 3.
- Gamrat, Petrus (Archbishop of Gnesen), 146, 181 n. 7.
- Garzoni, Quirino (Roman gentleman), 27.
- Gaurico, Luca Pomponio (astrologer), 537.
- Gentile de Faenza, Antonino (goldsmith), 598.
- George of Austria (Bishop of Liège), 103, 110.
- Ghinucci, Girolamo, Cardinal, 33.
- Giacobbe [Diego Mantino] (Jewish physician), 528.
- Giacomelli, Jacopo (professor at the Roman University), 540.
- Giacomello Giacomo (Bishop of Belcastro), 167, 178, 219 n. 4.
- Giberti, Gian Matteo (Bishop of Verona), 152, 466, 468, 543.
- Giese, Tiedemann (Bishop of Culm), 549.
- Gilio, Giovanni Andrea, 618 *seq.*
- Giocondo, Fra (architect), 642.
- Giovanni da Calvi (Franciscan), 40 n. 1.
- „ da Udine (painter), 576, 600.
- Giovio [Jovius], Paolo, 176 n. 3, 177, 194, 282, 530, 536, 603 *seq.*, 605, 655, 658.
- Girolamo da Fano (painter), 618.

- Gomes, Anton (S.J.), 121 n. 1.
- Gonzaga, Elisabetha (Duchess of Urbino), 176 n. 3, 325 n. 1, 366 n. 3, 398 n. 1, 477 n. 1.
- „ Ercole, Cardinal, 132 n. 1, 141 n. 1, 143 n. 3, 147 n. 2, 183 n. 1, 189 n. 1, 191 *seq.*, 193, 203 n. 1, 210 n. 3, 213, 218, 231 n. 3, 233, 306, 312 n. 1, 321, 443, 460 n. 2, 512, 545, 614, 659-662, 665, 670, 672-675, 677, 682.
- „ Ercole, Cardinal, the mother of, 462 n. 2.
- „ Ferrante (brother of Federigo, viceroy of Naples, Governor of Milan), 183 n. 1, 192 n. 3, 320 *seq.*, 334, 369 *seqq.*, 373, 376 *seqq.*, 380, 382, 385, 435, 450 *seq.*, 670, 677.
- „ Giulia, 497.
- Gonzalvez, Luis, de Camara (S.J.) 1 n., 8 n. 5, 9, 60, 99.
- „ Sebastian (S.J.), 114 n. 4.
- Gouvea, Diego de, 98.
- Granada, Louis of, *see* Louis.
- Granvelle, Antoine Perrenot de (Bishop of Arras; son of the following), 158, 160, 171.
- „ Nicolas Perrenot de (statesman), 147, 151, 158-162, 163 n. 5, 164, 166, 171 *seq.*, 188, 195, 199, 209, 214, 217, 220, 223, 226 *seq.*, 277, 286, 301, 303, 309
- Granvelle, Nicolas—*continued.*
n. 1, 313 n. 4, 316 n. 2, 322 *seq.*, 331, 376 *seqq.*, 380, 382, 391 n. 1, 442, 449, 661, 678.
- Grassi, Achille de', Cardinal, 248, 309.
- Gregory the Great, St., Pope, 616.
- „ XIII., Pope, 59 n. 4, 63 n. 2, 618 n. 2.
- Grimaldi, Girolamo, Cardinal, 183 n. 1.
- Grimani, Marco (Patriarch of Aquileia), 472 *seq.*
- „ Marino, Cardinal, 171, 195, 198, 209, 494, 545, 668.
- Gropper, Johann (theologian), 110 n. 4, 280 *seq.*, 342.
- Grünenstein, Wolfgang von (Abbot of Kempten), 103.
- Gualterio, Sebastian, 682.
- Gualteruzzi, Carlo, 127 n. 1, 173 n. 2, 531.
- Guglielmo (Sicilian hermit), 521.
- Guicciardini, Girolamo, 177 n. 1, 739.
- Guiche, Claude de la (Bishop of Agde), 244.
- Guidiccioni, Alessandro (nuncio), 220 n. 2, 237 n. 2.
- „ Bartolommeo (Vicar-general of Parma, afterwards Cardinal), 33 *seq.*, 36, 125 n. 6, 126, 154, 209, 312 n. 1, 397, 499, 503 n. 3, 505, 541, 543, 605.
- „ Giovanni (Bishop of Fossombrone, nuncio), 538 *seq.*

- Guidoni, Guido (Archdeacon of Modena, confessor to Ercole II. of Ferrara), 86.
- Guinigi, V. (of Lucca), 126 n. 3.
- Guise, Charles (of Lorraine), Cardinal, 367 n. 2, 383 *seq.*, 386, 669.
- Guisoni, Fermo, 660 n. 2.
- Gustavus Wasa (King of Sweden), 477 *seq.*
- HANNART, J. (envoy), 483 n. 1.
- Hans (Margrave of Brandenburg-Cüstrin), 293, 302, 326, 334 n. 5, 415, 425.
- Hassan Aga, Pasha, 129.
- Heeze, Dietrich von, 18, 102.
- Helding, Michael (Coadjutor of Mayence, Bishop of Merseburg and Sidon), 104, 255, 413.
- Henry IV. (the Emperor), 197.
- „ VIII. (King of England), 100 *seq.*, 152, 172, 184 *seq.*, 186, 192, 210, 335, 456-475.
- „ II. (King of France), 360, 383 *seq.*, 386, 420, 432, 435, 446, 449, 487, 521. *See* Henry, Duke of Orleans.
- „ Duke of Brunswick, 204, 238, 292.
- „ Duke of Orleans (second son of Francis I., afterwards King Henry II. of France), 128, 185, 200, 320.
- „ of Portugal, Cardinal, 126, 243 n. 1.
- Hernandez, Diego, 49 n. 1.
- Heusenstamm, Sebastian von (Elector of Mayence), 275, 423, 425.
- Hoffmeister, Johann (Provincial of the Augustinians), 279, 530.
- Honorius (Roman Emperor), 638.
- „ Joannes (a Greek, scriptor at the Vatican Library), 547 n. 5.
- Hosius, Stanislaus (Bishop of Ermeland), 489 n. 3, 490.
- Hutten, Moritz von (Bishop of Eichstätt), 106, 164, 168, 179, 278.
- Hyacinth of Poland, St., 521 n. 2.
- IDIAQUEZ (Imperial secretary), 188, 236.
- Ignatius of Antioch, St., 3 n. 3.
- „ of Loyola, St., 1-45, 47-57, 58-62, 65-71, 73-88, 90 *seqq.*, 94, 96-99, 101, 108 n. 2, 113, 120, 122, 504, 585, 642.
- Iñigo of Oña, St. (Benedictine abbot), 3 n. 3.
- Innocent III., Pope, 44.
- „ X., Pope, 593.
- Insoni, Gasparo (astronomer), 537.
- Iter, Lucius (Bishop of Coire), 163.
- JACOBAZZI, Cristoforo, Cardinal (Bishop of Cassano), 541.
- Jacomo (sculptor) 632 n.
- James V. (King of Scotland), 100, 465 *seq.*, 471 *seq.*
- „ the wife of, 465.
- Janitius, Clement (poet), 534.
- Japan, the Emperor of, 121.
- Joachim I. (Elector of Brandenburg), 144, 389, 413, 415, 426 *seq.*

- John III. (King of Portugal),
20, 45-49, 92, 98
seq., 112 *seq.*, 117,
155, 163, 195,
238, 244, 514 n.
1, 517, 638.
,, the son of, 99.
,, of Denmark (son of King
Frederick I.), 479.
,, Frederick (Elect of Sax-
ony), 204, 214, 256,
279, 292, 298, 357-
360, 375, 389, 415,
428.
,, of Avila, St., 18, 94 n. 1,
96.
Julius II., Pope, 462, 524, 550
seq., 553, 573, 576,
595, 632, 634, 639,
655.
,, III., Pope, 34 n. 5, 59.
Justinian II. (Emperor), 197.
- KALCKBRENNER, Gerhard (Car-
thusian), 18.
Kempton, the Prince Abbot
of, 103.
Kessel, Leonhard, 85 n. 1, 91
n. 1.
- LABACCO, Mario Antonio (archi-
tect), 602, 639.
La Baume, Pierre de (Arch-
bishop of Besançon), 181.
Lamberg, Ambrosius von (Dean
of Salzburg), 157, 158.
Lancilotti (S.J.), 118 n. 3, 119
n. 1.
Landini, Silvestro (S.J.), 80 n.
6, 88.
Lascaris, Giano (humanist),
547.
Lasso, D., 405 n. 1, 451 n. 3.
Laurentius, Thomas (Inquisi-
tor), 21.
Laureo, Marco (Dominican),
267.
- Laurerio, Dionisio (General of
the Servites), Cardinal,
152, 504 n., 505.
Layne, Diego (S.J.), 2 n. 6,
8 *seq.*, 22, 25 *seq.*, 30 n. 1,
31, 34, 50, 79-84, 86 n. 1,
87, 89, 266, 343, 527,
540.
Le Jay, Claude (S.J.), 22, 25
seq., 55, 56 n. 1, 78 *seqq.*,
82, 86, 104, 106 *seqq.*, 111,
134.
Leo the Great, St., Pope, 110.
,, X., Pope, 384, 463, 524,
526, 532, 536 *seq.*, 538
seq., 547, 554, 595, 651
seq., 655.
,, III., the Emperor, 197.
,, XIII., Pope, 59 n. 4.
Leonardo da Barletta (human-
ist), 528.
Leoni, Leone (goldsmith), 599
seq.
Leto, Pomponio (humanist),
523.
Leuti, Pellegrino di (goldsmith),
596 n. 2, 599.
Lhoost, Jakob (S.J.), 89.
Lignières, Jacques de (French
envoy to Trent), 270.
Lippomano, Andrea, 83, 548
n. 7.
,, J. (nuncio), 46
n. 2.
,, Luigi (Bishop of
Verona), 84,
436, 437 n. 2,
439, 509 n. 1.
Loaysa, Garcia de, Cardinal,
637 n. 2.
Loffredo (Bishop of Capaccio),
251 n. 4, 254, 351.
Lombard, Peter, 71, 348.
Lombay, the Marquis Francisco
de (son of Juan III., Duke
of Gandia), *see* Borgia,
Francis.

- Lorenzetto (sculptor), 594.
 Lorenzo, Lodovico di (sculptor), 558.
 Lorraine, Jean de, Cardinal, 155 n. 1, 669.
 Louis (Duke of Bavaria), 181 n. 7.
 „ (Elector Palatine), 293, 389, 415, 426.
 „ XII. (King of France), 492.
 „ of Granada, 18, 95.
 Loyola, Family of the, 2, 6, 30 n. 2.
 Loysier, Jean (Abbot of Citeaux), 212.
 Ludolf of Saxony (Carthusian), 5, 6, 16.
 Luther, Martin, 106, 215 *seqq.*, 217, 256, 279 *seq.*, 342, 482, 494 *seq.*, 511, 540, 545, 550.
 Luzzi, Luzio (painter), 576.
- MACHIAVELLI, Niccolò, 475 n. 2.
 Maciejowski (Vice-chancellor of Poland), 489.
 Madruzzo, Aliprando, 225.
 „ Cristoforo (Bishop of Trent), Cardinal, 78, 153 *seq.*, 158, 167, 202, 211, 217 *seq.*, 235 n., 242, 247, 249 *seqq.*, 252 *seq.*, 256 *seq.*, 258, 261 n., 265, 267 n. 3, 287 *seq.*, 290 *seq.*, 300, 308 *seq.*, 311, 318, 337, 339, 346, 365, 393 *seqq.*, 397 *seqq.*, 406, 409, 411, 434, 436, 442, 673, 679, 681.
 „ Niccolò (brother to Cristoforo), 220.
- Maffei, Bernardino (secretary to Paul III.), Cardinal, 262, 291 n. 1, 305, 310 n. 3, 316 *seq.*, 327 n. 3, 355 n. 3, 365, 443, 529, 531, 541.
 „ Girolamo (overseer of the Roman streets), 565.
 Maffei, Joannes Petrus (S.J.), 3 n.
 Maggiorano, Niccolò da (custodian of the Vatican Library), 546 n. 2, 547.
 Magnus, Olaus (Archbishop of Upsala), 242, 478 n. 2.
 Major, George (Protestant theologian), 280.
 Malatesta, L., 675.
 Maltitz, Johann (Bishop of Meissen), 103.
 Malvenda (Dominican), 279 *seq.*, 413.
 Manarei, P. (S.J.), 57 n. 5.
 Manetti, Latino Giovenale (humanist), 537. *seq.*, 563 *seqq.*, 568 n. 2.
 Manfredi, Family of the, 675.
 Mangone, Giovanni (architect), 557, 574 n. 2, 602.
 Manriquez, Alonso (Archbishop of Seville), Cardinal, 516.
 „ Isabella (Duchess of Amalfi), 497.
 Mantino, Diego, *see* Giacobbe.
 Manuel (King of Portugal), 45.
 Marchi, Francesco de', 557.
 Marco da Siena (artist), 576 *seq.*
 Marcus Aurelius (the Emperor), 571, 573.
 Margaret of Navarre (sister to Francis I. of France), 485, 669.

- Margaret of Austria (natural daughter of Charles V., married, 1st, to Alessandro de' Medici, 2nd, to Ottavio Farnese of Parma), 42 *seq.*, 45, 52, 126, 176, 191 *seq.*, 193, 233, 450, 658.
- Maria (Governor of the Netherlands, sister to Charles V.), 206, 292, 465.
- „ (eldest daughter of Charles V.), 200.
- „ (wife of the Emperor Honorius, daughter of Stilicho), 638.
- Marillac, 475.
- Marinari, Antonio (Carmelite), 540.
- Mario, Paolo, 366 n. 3.
- Marliano, Bartolommeo, 565.
- Marmitta, Jacopo (poet), 531 n. 1.
- „ Lorenzo (worker on crystal), 600.
- Marot, Clement, 492.
- Marquina (secretary to Charles V.), 230, 236, 257 n. 1, 274, 276, 283, 315 n. 4.
- Martelli, Braccio (Bishop of Fiesole), 243, 254, 265.
- „ Niccolò, 612.
- Martinellis, Blasius de (Papal master of ceremonies), 571 n., 611, 631 n. 3.
- Martinengo (nuncio to Poland), 490.
- Martirano, Coriolano (Bishop of S. Marco), 248, 350.
- Mary Stuart (daughter of James V. of Scotland, afterwards Queen), 100, 472, 474.
- Massarelli, Angelo (a secretary of the Council of Trent), 78 n. 4, 82, 199 n. 1, 202 n. 1, 211, 219 n. 4, 247 *seq.*, 249 n. 1, 256, 353 n. 2, 402.
- Massolus, Bart. (Papal commissary at Perugia), 587 n. 10.
- Maurice of Saxony (Duke), 292 *seq.*, 297, 302, 326, 334 n. 5, 358, 387, 415, 423, 425, 427.
- Maximilian (Archduke of Austria), 389 n. 1.
- „ (Count of Büren), *see* Egmont.
- Medde, F. de (Somasch.), 54 n. 7.
- Medici, Cosimo de' (Duke of Florence), 87, 126, 148, 159, 176, 192, 282-285, 370, 385, 535, 658, 663, 681.
- „ Gian Angelo de' (Archbishop of Ragusa, afterwards Pope Pius IV.), 443.
- Melanchthon, Philip, 106, 205, 256, 279 *seq.*, 359, 484, 550.
- Melegghino, Jacopo (architect), 562, 574, 602, 631 n. 4.
- Melem, Ogier von (deputy from Frankfort to the Diet of Worms), 393 n. 1.
- Mendoza, Diego Hurtado de (Imperial envoy), 158, 162, 212, 219, 242, 251, 258, 270, 309 n. 1, 310, 318, 322, 336 n. 1, 337 *seqq.*, 360-364, 367 *seq.*, 373, 380, 381 n. 2., 382, 384, 395, 398, 404 *seqq.*, 408, 411, 430, 432, 434, 437 n. 1, 442 *seq.*, 444 *seq.*, 449 *seq.*
- „ Francisco de, Cardinal, 93, 95, 202, 355, 420.
- „ Juan de, 319, 347

- Mendoza, Rodrigo de (Bishop of Salamanca), 95.
- Mercurian, Everard (S.J.), 23 n. 1.
- Merino, Gabriel, Cardinal, 516.
- Metellus (an official of the Vatican Library), 546 n. 2.
- Metzenhausen, Johannes von (Elector of Treves), 141, 168 n. 2, 181 n. 7, 256 n. 1.
- Michael Angelo, 454 *seq.*, 551-554, 561 *seq.*, 571 *seqq.*, 581 *seq.*, 586 n. 2, 594 *seq.*, 600, 603 *seq.*, 606, 608-612, 615 *seq.*, 618 *seqq.*, 626-635, 640-648, 659 *seq.*
- Michele, Giovanni (Archbishop of Acerenza-Matera), 401 n. 1.
- Mignanelli, Fabio (Bishop of Lucera, nuncio), 199 n. 2, 214, 217, 224, 229 n. 1, 381 n. 1, 382, 673.
- Mocenigo, Aloysius, 276 n. 1, 296 n. 2, 393 n. 1.
- Mochi, Prospero, (architect), 557, 594 n. 1.
- Molossi, Baldassare (poet), 529.
- Molza, Francesco Maria (poet), 530.
- Mombaers, Jan (a brother of "The Common Life"), 16.
- Monaldeschi, Lorenzo, 588 n. 2.
- Monte, Gian Maria Ciocchi del, Cardinal (President of the Council of Trent, afterwards Pope Julius III.), 79, 111, 154, 209 *seqq.*, 240 *seqq.*, 245 *seqq.*, 248 n. 6, 307 *seq.*, 311, 341, 344, 348-353, 396, 398, 401 *seqq.*, 431, 434, 436, 444, 448.
- Montelupo, Raffaello da (sculptor), 576, 579 n. 2, 594.
- Montemellino, Giovanni Francesco (architect), 561, 563.
- Montemerlo (secretary to Cardinal Farnese), 310.
- Montesa, Fernando (secretary to Cardinal Mendoza), 434.
- Montfort (Imperial orator), 137.
- Montmorency, the Constable, de, 360.
- Montorsoli (sculptor), 594.
- Morani, Eurialo, of Ascoli (poet), 532.
- More, Thomas (chancellor of England), 458 *seqq.*
- Morone, Giovanni (Bishop of Modena), Cardinal, 85, 86 n. 1, 104, 106, 108, 131-138, 140 *seqq.*, 149, 152, 154, 158, 161 n. 1, 170 n., 171, 178-181, 185 n. 4, 195, 198 *seq.*, 209, 219, 238, 361, 366, 397, 404, 443, 478 n. 1, 500-503, 536, 541, 665, 676, 679.
- Mosca, Simone (sculptor), 588, 594.
- Mulio, Petrus, 568 n. 1.
- Muñoz, Michael (Bishop of Cuença), 95.
- Mussi, Cornelio (Bishop of Bertinoro and Bitonto), 166, 212, 213 n. 3, 219 n. 4, 241.
- NACHIANTI, Giacomo (Bishop of Chioggia), 243, 259.
- Nadal, Jerónimo (S.J.), 8 n. 5, 51, 59, 90.
- Najera, the Duke of, 4.
- Nausea, F. (Bishop of Vienna), 108, 165, 174, 548 n. 5.
- Navarro, Dr., 517 n. 1.
- „ Francesco (Bishop of Badajoz), 82, 253 *seq.*, 447, 449.
- Naves (Imperial vice-chancellor), 137 *seq.*
- Nebbia, Cesare (painter), 619 n. 3.

- Necoda (a Chinese pirate),
120.
- Newdigate, Seb. (English Carthusian martyr), 459 n. 1.
- Nicolas, V. Pope, 559, 569, 574.
- „ Veronensis (Augustinian hermit), 493 n. 5.
- Nifo, Agostino (philosopher), 526.
- Nino, Ferdinand (Archbishop of Granada, Patriarch of the West Indies), 516.
- Nobili, Benedetto de' (Bishop of Accia), 219 n. 4, 311, 340.
- Nobrega, (S.J.), 517 n. 1.
- Nuñez, Barreto (S.J.), 99, 113.
- OCHINO, Bernardino (General of the Capuchins, afterwards apostate), 84, 497 *seq.*, 500 *seq.*, 513.
- Odasio, David (Papal chamberlain), 198, 199 n. 1.
- Olaf II., St. (King of Norway), 481.
- Oleastro, Hieronymus ab (Dominican), 244.
- Oliva, Fr. (architect), 592 n.
- Oliveri, Benvenuto, 632 n.
- Olivier (French chancellor), 446.
- Ori, Matthæus (Dominican inquisitor), 21, 30, 483 n. 1.
- Orlandini, Nicolas (S.J.) 3 n., 60 n. 4.
- Orsini, Camillo, 450 *seqq.*, 683.
- „ Elena, 603.
- „ Giulio, 441 *seq.*, 444 *seq.*, 681.
- Ortiz, Pedro (Imperial plenipotentiary in Rome), 24, 26 *seq.*, 103, 462, 543.
- Osorio, Leonora (wife of the Spanish envoy, Juan de Vega), 42, 43 n. 2.
- Otto, Henry (Palsgrave of Pfalz-Neuburg), 205.
- Oviedo, Andrés (S.J.), 53 n. 1, 59 n. 4.
- PAALSSON, Ogmund (Bishop of Skalholt), 481.
- Pacheco, Pedro (Bishop of Jaén), Cardinal, 202, 240 n., 243, 250 *seq.*, 253, 261 n., 266 *seq.*, 269, 304, 307 *seq.*, 318, 339 *seq.*, 344, 346, 350, 352 *seq.*, 447.
- Padilla, Juan de (Franciscan missionary in Kansas), 515.
- Pagni, Lorenzo (secretary), 159.
- Paleario, A., 496 n. 1.
- Palladius, Blosius [Biagio Pallai], Bishop of Foligno, 80, 539.
- Palladius, Peter, 480.
- Pallavicini, Sforza, Marquis, 143 n. 4, 174, 378 *seqq.*
- „ Uberto, 174 n. 4.
- Pamphili, Eusebius, *see* Calvin.
- Parenzi, Vincenzo, 312 n. 1, 405 n. 1, 407 n. 1.
- Parisio, Pier Paolo, Cardinal, 144 n. 3, 154, 160, 170, 174, 186, 209, 505.
- Pascual, Iñes, 20.
- Pastorino da Siena, 575, 608.
- Pate, Richard (Bishop of Worcester), 166.
- Paul III., Pope, 17, 24, 28 *seq.*, 31, 33 *seq.*, 37-41, 45-48, 50, 53 n. 1, 55, 60, 83 *seqq.*, 90, 92, 95, 97 *seq.*, 100, 103 *seq.*, 111 *seq.*, 122, 125-129, 131-151, 154 *seqq.*, 159, 163 *seqq.*, 169-175, 177-198, 200 *seq.*, 207-210, 216-220, 223-238, 241, 246-253, 255 *seqq.*, 261-264, 270, 273-276,

Paul III.—*continued.*

- 282-286, 288-292,
296, 299, 300-307,
311-335, 337 *seqq.*,
347, 350-369, 373
seq., 375-390, 394-
398, 404-408, 410
seqq., 417-420, 422
seq., 429-436, 439-
455, 456, 458-466,
468 *seqq.*, 472 *seqq.*,
482-485, 488, 490-
494, 503 *seq.*, 507-
515, 517, 522, 525
seq., 528 *seq.*, 531-
559, 562-569, 571,
573-577, 579, 581-
585, 588-600, 602-
606, 608-612, 615
seq., 631 *seqq.*, 635-
639, 642, 644 *seqq.*,
648.
- „ *see also* Farnese, Ales-
sandro.
- „ IV., Pope, 85, 617.
- „ V., Pope, 614 n. 1.
- Pelargus, Ambrosius (Domi-
nican), 256 n. 1.
- Pelori, Gianbattista (architect),
586 n. 1.
- Peña, Juan de (Dominican), 95.
- Pérac, Etienne du (engraver),
573.
- Peregrino, Fabrizio (Mantuan
envoy), 461 n. 4, 462 n. 1,
463 n. 4, 465 n. 4, 483 n.
1, 579 n., 583 n. 1.
- Perez, Francisco (S.J.), 117 n.
3, 118 n. 6, 121 n.
- Perino da Vinci (sculptor), 594.
- Perotti, Angelo (poet), 533.
- Peruschi, Camillo (rector of the
Roman University), 527.
- Peruzzi, Baldassare (architect),
553 *seq.*, 603, 635, 642, 651.
- Petersson, Olaf (Protestant theo-
logian), 477.
- Petro de Senis (sculptor), 593
n. 3.
- Pflug, Julius (Bishop of Naum-
burg), 104, 278, 281, 325
n. 5, 342, 413.
- Philip (Landgrave of Hesse),
185, 204, 206, 279,
281, 292, 295, 298,
357, 360, 375, 426
seq.
- „ (Prince of Spain), after-
wards Philip II.), 83,
92, 97, 174 n. 4, 195.
- Piccolomini, Alessandro (Bishop
of Piacenza), 267.
- Pietro (Patriarch of the Maron-
ites), 521 n.
- Pighini, Sebastiano (auditor of
the Rota), 245, 436 *seq.*, 439.
- Pighius, A., 342.
- Pinius, Joannes (S.J.), 3 n.
- Pio, Battista (humanist), 528.
- „ Bonaventura (Minorite),
540.
- „ Rodolfo, of Carpi (Bishop
of Faenza and Girgenti),
Cardinal, 42, 56 n. 1, 89,
126, 169, 175, 231, 466
n. 5, 505 n. 1, 541, 586
n. 1.
- Piombo, Sebastiano del (painter),
581, 602, 609.
- Pisani, Francesco, Cardinal, 231.
- Pius IV., Pope, 98 n. 2, 617.
- „ V., Pope, 63 n. 2.
- Plantagenet, Lady Margaret
(mother of Cardinal Pole),
470.
- Plotis, de, 638 n. 4.
- Poggio, Giovanni Francesco
(nuncio), 92, 137 n. 1, 147
n. 6, 155, 162, 163 n. 1,
188, 209, 213, 238, 664.
- Polanco, Juan de (S.J.), 2 n. 4,
17 n. 1, 31, 39 n. 1, 43 n.
5, 51, 52 n. 2, 58 *seq.*, 86,
87, 92 n. 2, 96 n. 2.

- Pole, Reginald, Cardinal, 154, 170, 209 *seq.*, 220 n. 2, 242, 248, 306, 307 n. 1, 397, 406 *seq.*, 465 *seqq.*, 469 *seq.*, 541, 543, 602, 605, 682.
- Porrino, Gandolfo (poet), 613.
- Porta, Giacomo della (architect), 648 n. 1.
- „ Giovanni Maria della (envoy from Urbino), 450 n. 4, 460 n. 2, 466 n. 2, 557 n. 2, 610 n. 2, 636 n. 6.
- „ Guglielmo della (sculptor), 454 *seq.*, 575 n. 1, 594.
- Portus, Franciscus (academician), 501 n. 3.
- Primaticcio, Francesco (artist), 602.
- Priuli, Luigi, 247.
- Pucci, Antonio, Cardinal, 663.
- QUADRO, Antonio (S.J.), 59.
- Quetta, Antonio (orator of King Ferdinand at Trent), 212.
- Quiñones, Francesco, Cardinal, 40 n. 1.
- Quistelli, Ambrogio (Augustinian hermit), 540.
- RABELAIS, 534 n. 4.
- Raimondi, Vincenzo (miniaturist), 608.
- Rainaldi, Girolamo (architect), 573.
- Raphael, 554, 576 *seq.*, 579, 600 *seq.*, 631, 642.
- Raymund of Pennafort, St., 68 n. 3.
- Rejadella, Teresa, sister, 28 n. 4.
- Rem, Andreas (Provost of Kötz), 78 n. 3.
- Renée [Renata], Duchess of Ferrara (daughter of Louis XII. of France), 86, 491 *seq.*
- Riario, Francesco Sforza (Archbishop of Lucca), 499.
- Ribadeneira, Pedro de (S.J.), 2 n., 8 n. 3, 9 n. 4, 51, 52 n. 1, 57, 105 n. 1.
- Ricci, Giovanni, da Montepulciano (Archbishop of Siponto, nuncio), 147 *seq.*, 148 n. 2, 187, 195, 661.
- „ Orlando, 153 n. 2.
- Ridolfi, Niccolò (Bishop of Vicenza, Archbishop of Florence), Cardinal, 87, 491.
- Riedmatten, Adrian von (Bishop of Sitten), 163.
- Rincon (French diplomat), 127.
- Rio, Martin Alfonso da (court official of the Emperor) 444 *seq.*
- Rion, Antonio (Jesuit lay-brother), 57.
- Rodi, Filippo, 374 n. 4.
- Rodriguez, Simon (S.J.), 22, 23 n. 1, 25, 28, 36 n. 2, 41 n. 3, 42 n. 2, 43 n. 1, 47 *seq.*, 49 n. 1, 53 n. 2, 83 n. 2, 98 *seq.*, 108 n. 2, 113 n. 1, 118 n. 5, 120 n. 2.
- Rohan, François de (French ambassador in Rome), 383.
- Rojas, Franz von (S.J.), 93 n. 2.
- Romano, Giulio (painter and architect), 577, 641.
- Romeo, Francesco (General of the Dominicans), 94, 441 n.
- Rorario, Girolamo (Papal chamberlain and envoy), 490.
- Roser, Isabel, 20, 27 n. 3, 28 n. 2, 30 n. 1, 52 *seqq.*
- Rosseto [Rhosaites], Michele (an official of the Vatican library), 546 n. 2.
- Rossi [Salviati], Francesco de' (painter), 608.

- Rossi, Monsignore de, 672.
 Roterus, Spiritus (O.P., Inquisitor), 483 n. 1.
 Rovere, Francesco Maria della (Duke of Urbino), 188, 284, 367 n. 2, 398 n. 1, 530 n. 4, 610 n. 2.
 „ Giulio della (brother to the Duke of Urbino), Cardinal, 367 n. 2.
 „ Guidobaldo della, 632.
 „ Lucrezia della, 589 n. 4.
 Ruano, Ferdinand, 546 n. 1.
 Ruggieri, Bonifazio (Ferrarese envoy), 133 n. 2, 192 n. 5, 333 n. 2, 355 n. 5, 380 n. 3, 452 n. 1.
 SABEO, Fausto (custodian of the Vatican library), 547.
 Sabino, Francesco Florido (humanist), 529.
 Sadoletto, Jacopo (Bishop of Carpentras), Cardinal, 145, 149, 155, 173, 231, 355, 396, 469, 486, 503, 538, 541 *seqq.*, 544, 546, 605, 664.
 Sagad, Claudius Athanasius (Negus of Abyssinia), 112.
 Sahagim, Joannes de (O.S.A.), 521 n. 2.
 St. Gall, the abbot of, 163.
 St. Urban, the abbot of, 163.
 Salis, Francesco de (Bishop of Bagnorea), 521 n. 2.
 Salmeron, Alfonso (S.J.), 22, 79-85, 100 *seq.*, 111, 266, 343.
 Salviati, Cardinal, 145 n. 1.
 Salviati, *see* Rossi, Francesco de'.
 Samminiato, 126 n. 1.
 Sanchez, Gabriel (Roman agent of Ferdinand I.), 461 n. 5, 484 n. 3, 583 n. 1.
 Sancta, Pietro (sculptor), 632 n.
 Sandoval (annalist), 174 n. 4.
 Sanfelice, Gian Tommaso (Bishop of La Cava), 152, 153 n., 154, 157, 158 n. 3, 166, 199, 211 *seq.*, 214, 219 n. 4, 245, 341.
 Sangallo, Antonio da (architect), 553 *seq.*, 555 *seqq.*, 559, 561, 562 n. 1, 574, 579, 581 *seq.*, 585, 586 n. 1, 588 *seq.*, 591, 592 n. 1, 593, 602, 606, 631, 635, 639 *seq.*, 641 *seqq.*, 645 *seq.*, 652, 655.
 „ Giovan Battista [Il Gobbo], 557, 602.
 Giuliano (architect), 642.
 Sansedoni, A. (envoy from Siena), 325 n. 1.
 Sansovino, Jacopo (painter), 574, 575 n. 1.
 Santa Croce, Prospero (nuncio), 419-425, 434.
 Santacruz, Martin (S.J.), 99 n. 3, 116.
 Santafiora, Cardinal, *see* Sforza, Guido Ascanio.
 Saraceni, Giov. Michele (Archbishop of Matera), 304, 307, 353, 401 n. 1.
 Sarpi, Paolo, 174 n. 4, 241 n., 354 n. 1.
 Satsuma, the Prince of [in Japan], 121.
 Sauli, Alessandro (Archbishop of Genoa), 55.
 Saurolo, Scipione, 617.
 Savelli, Flaminio, 199.
 „ Giovanni Battista (leader of mercenaries), 296.
 „ Jacopo, Cardinal, 541.
 Savonarola, Girolamo, 16, 284, 419.

- Sbotta, Joannes, 591 n. 2.
 Schankwitz (leader of Schmalkaldic forces), 294.
 Schärtlin von Burtenbach, Sebastian (leader of Schmalkaldic forces), 294 *seq.*, 298, 303.
 Schneepf, Erhard (Protestant theologian), 279.
 Schönberg, Nicolas von (Archbishop of Capua, Cardinal, 462, 536 n. 4, 549.
 Schorich, Peter (S.J.), 85 n. 1.
 Scoto [Scotti], Giovanni Bernardino (Theatin), 55 n. 1.
 Senso, Lodovico (poet), 526 n. 4.
 Seripando, Girolamo (General of the Augustinian Hermits), 80, 239 n. 3, 243, 250, 265, 341 *seqq.*, 429, 509 n. 1, 544.
 Serlio (architect), 553 n. 3.
 Sermoneta, Girolamo (painter and architect), 576 *seq.*, 600.
 „ Luzio (painter), 600.
 Sernini, Nino, 125 n. 3, 132 n. 1, 144 n. 3, 145 n. 1, 147 n. 2, 149 n. 2, 150 n. 1, 154 n., 156 n. 2, 503 n. 3, 614, 659-662, 665.
 Seroni, Ferdinando (Bishop of Venosa), 494.
 Serristori, Averrardo (Florentine envoy), 126 n. 1, 147 n. 5, 150 n. 2, 187 n., 193 n. 1, 367, 436 n. 2, 437 n. 1, 443 n. 6, 448 n. 4, 560 n. 4, 566 n. 2, 580 n. 1, 633 n. 3, 639 n. 2, 663.
 Severoli, Ercole (promotor at the Council of Trent), 78 n. 4, 240 n., 259 n. 1, 269, 353 n. 2, 402.
 Seymour, Jane (wife of Henry VIII. of England), 463.
 Sfondrato, Francesco (Bishop of Sarno, Archbishop of Amalfi), Cardinal, 185, 189, 202 n. 1, 207, 209, 232 n. 3, 335, 362-366, 376-379, 391, 394-397, 399 n. 1, 411 *seq.*, 418, 421, 423 *seq.*, 432, 434, 474, 505 n. 1.
 Sforza, Bona, 455 n. 1.
 „ Guido Ascanio, of Santa Fiora (Bishop of Parma), Cardinal, 88, 126, 213 n. 3, 219 *seq.*, 305 n. 3, 310 *seqq.*, 315, 316 n. 2, 338, 361, 366, 528, 559 n. 1, 657.
 Sigismund (German heretic) 491.
 „ I. (King of Poland), 488 *seq.*
 „ Augustus (King of Poland), 146, 163, 181 n. 7, 301, 489 *seq.*, 597 n. 2, 636 n. 6.
 Siliceo, Juan Martinez (Archbishop of Toledo, Primate of Spain), 93, 521 n. 2.
 Silva, Miguel da (Bishop of Viseu), Cardinal, 47 *seq.*, 148 n. 3, 150, 155.
 „ Pedro da (S.J.) 121 n. 1.
 Silverio, Giovanni (architect), 635 n. 4.
 Silvestro (S.J.), 88.
 Simonetti, Lodovico (Bishop of Pesaro), 219 n. 4.
 Siney, the Lord of (French envoy), 168 n. 4.
 Sinzenhofer, Pancratius (Bishop of Ratisbon), 106, 157.
 Sirleto, Antonino, 680.
 „ Guglielmo (humanist), 526, 546 n. 2.
 Sixtus IV., Pope, 38, 267, 570, 611.

- Sixtus V., Pope, 566, 619, 654 n. 7.
- Sleidan, Johann (historian), 216 *seq.*
- Sodoma (painter), 603.
- Somerset, the Protector, 474, 476.
- Sophianos, Nicolas (scriptor at the Vatican library), 547.
- Soto, Pedro Domenico (Dominican, confessor to Charles V.), 195, 199, 243, 277, 286, 365, 411, 413, 423, 544.
- Spinola, Family of the, 386.
- Stadion, Christoph von (Bishop of Augsburg), 134, 137, 165.
- Stella, Pietro (sculptor), 594 n. 4.
- „ Tommaso, (Bishop of Salpe), 346.
- Steuco, Agostino (official at the Vatican library), 545, 613 n. 3.
- Stilicho, 638.
- Store, Johannes Magnus (Archbishop of Upsala), 478 n. 2.
- Strozza, L., 237 n. 2.
- Strozzi, Uberto, 449 n. 1, 682.
- Suarez, Francesco (S.J.), 67 n. 3.
- Suleiman I. (the Sultan), 124, 129, 386.
- TAGLIAVA, Pietro (Archbishop of Palermo), 242, 254, 447.
- Talavera, Paulus de (Bishop of Tlascalala), 518.
- Tapper, Ruard (chancellor of Louvain University), 102.
- Tasfa Sion, 548 n. 2.
- Tauler, Joannes (Dominican), 110.
- Taurino, Hieronymus de (Dominican), 491 n. 3.
- Tavera, Diego (Grand Inquisitor of Spain), 92.
- „ Juan de (Archbishop of Toledo), Cardinal, 92, 519.
- Teixeira, Manoel (S.J.), 121 n.
- Teodolo, Hieronymus (Bishop of Cadix), 219 n. 4.
- Teutleben, Valentin von (Bishop of Hildesheim), 165, 167 *seq.*, 171 n. 1, 179, 210 n. 2.
- Thomas Aquinas, St., 71, 77, 348.
- „ of Celano (Franciscan), 621.
- „ à Kempis, 16.
- „ de Vio, Cardinal, *see* Cajetan.
- Tiene, Gaetano de, S., *see* Gaetano.
- Tiraboschi, 526 n. 4.
- Tiranno, Girolamo (envoy), 226 n. 4, 325 n. 1, 477 n. 1, 677.
- Titian, 455, 603, 617.
- Toledo, Francisco de (Imperial orator at Trent), 258, 265, 339.
- „ Juan de, Cardinal (of Burgos), 504 *seq.*
- „ Pedro de (Viceroy of Naples), 212, 213, 222, 509.
- Tolomei, Claudio, 531.
- „ Lattanzio (Sienese envoy), 148 n. 3, 150 n. 1, 509 n. 2, 560 n. 2, 663.
- Tommasoni, Alessandro, 372.
- Torres, Miguel, 50 n. 1, 52 n. 2, 54 n. 1, 94 n. 1, 95.
- Tournon, F. de, Cardinal, 669.
- Tretius, Joannes Baptista Albinianus (theologian), 540.
- „ Petrus Albinianus, 541 n. 1.

- Trissino, Giangiorgio (poet),
533.
- Trivulzio, Agostino, Cardinal,
126, 141 n. 1, 231, 661,
682.
- Tropea, Teofilo di (Dominican,
theologian at the Roman
University), 540.
- Truchsess, Otto von (Bishop of
Augsburg), Cardinal, 78, 80, 82,
104, 107, 110, 134,
145 *seq.*, 163 *seqq.*,
199, 203, 214, 217,
220 *seq.*, 256, 257
n. 2, 286 *seq.*, 288
n. 3, 314, 389 n. 1,
440 n. 3, 543.
- „ Otto von, the brother
of, 220.
- Turiano, Baldassare (magistrate
of Castiglione), 88.
- UGHI, Giovanni Francesco, 643.
- Ugolini, Aurelio Manni, 473 n. 2.
- Ulrich (Duke of Wurtemberg),
221, 326, 427.
- Urban VIII. Pope, 454.
- d'Urfé, Claude (French envoy
in Trent), 270, 452 n. 2.
- VAGA, Perino del (painter), 574,
576 *seqq.*, 581, 600-603,
608, 631.
- Valdes, Alfonso, 495.
- „ Juan, 495-498.
- Valerianus, Pierius (geographer),
530 n. 5.
- Valignani, Alexander (S.J., visi-
tor in India and Japan),
121 n.
- Varano, Giovanni Maria (Duke
of Camerino and
Nepi), 98, 126, 398
n. 1.
- „ Matteo, 187 n.
- Varda, Paul de (Archbishop of
Gran), 443.
- Vargas, Francesco, 400, 402.
- Varo, Matthæus de (a Greek,
scriptor in the Vatican
Library), 547 n. 5.
- Vasari, G. (painter and his-
torian), 530, 579, 581, 603
seq., 606 *seq.*, 611, 617.
- Vasto, Alfonso d'Avalos, Mar-
quis del (governor of
Milan), 141 n. 1, 143 n.
3, 147 n. 2, 173, 176, 182
n. 2.
- Vaz, Juan (companion to St.
Francis Xavier), 116.
- Vega, Juan de (Spanish envoy,
Viceroy of Sicily), 42, 89,
174 n. 4, 178, 185, 189,
191 *seq.*, 193, 194 n. 2,
201, 234, 236, 282, 285,
290 *seq.*, 314, 356, 360,
677.
- Velasco, Dr., 400.
- Velasquez, Juan, 4.
- Vellutello, 550.
- Vendromini, Andreas (Arch-
bishop of Corfù), 178.
- Venusti, Marcello (painter),
614 *seq.*
- Verallo, Girolamo (nuncio), 23,
32, 108, 137 n. 2, 142,
145 *seq.*, 162 *seqq.*, 166,
190, 214, 220, 229 n. 1,
236, 238, 257 n. 1, 269
n. 1, 274, 286, 288, 290,
296, 301, 308 *seqq.*, 313 n.
4, 316 n. 2, 319, 322 *seq.*,
325, 327, 329-333, 335
seq., 354, 357-360, 443.
- Vergara, Alonzo Ramirez de, 93.
- Vergerio, Pietro Paolo (Bishop
of Capo d' Istria, nuncio,
afterwards apostate), 511,
513.
- Verme, del, Count, 320, 322
seq.

- Vermigli, Pietro Martire, 497-501.
- Veronese, Paolo (painter), 619.
- Vettori, Pier, 531.
- Vida, Marco Girolamo (Bishop of Alba), 494 n. 2, 532.
- Vigili, Fabio (Bishop of Spolito), 532.
- Vignola, Jacopo de (architect), 553 n. 3, 593, 602 n. 4, 676.
- Villanova, Thomas of (Augustinian, Archbishop of Valencia), 95.
- Villanueva, Francesco de (S.J.), 93 n. 3, 96 n. 2.
- Vinck, Anton (S.J.), 45 n. 2, 103 n. 1.
- Viola (S.J.), 59 n. 4, 102 n. 1.
- Vischaven, Cornelius (S.J.), 102.
- Vitelli, Alessandro (condottiere), 169, 560 n. 2, 561.
- „ Paolo (condottiere), 143 n. 4.
- Vittoria, Francisco à (theologian), 543.
- Vivaldini, 421 n. 2.
- Vives, Alphonso de (Benedictine), 492 n. 3.
- Volterra, Daniele da (painter), 574, 575 n. 1, 603, 618.
- Vorst, Peter van der (Bishop of Acqui), 478 n. 1.
- WANEMAN, Balthasar (suffragan-bishop of Hildesheim), 167, 171 n. 1.
- Weeze, 478 n. 2.
- Westhof (Carmelite), 409 n. 2.
- Widmanstetter, Johann Albrecht, 549.
- Wied, Hermann von (Elector of Cologne), 104, 108, 110, 205 *seq.*, 228 *seq.*, 275, 325.
- William IV. (Duke of Bavaria), 111, 134, 137, 164, 181 n. 7, 227, 286, 288, 293, 596 n. 4.
- „ (Duke of Julier and Cleves), 206 *seq.*, 272.
- Wolfgang of Zweibrücken (Count Palatine), 425.
- XIMENES, Cardinal, 16.
- ZACCHIA (sculptor), 594.
- Zannettini, Dionigi (Bishop of Chironia), 167, 178, 341.
- Zapolya, Johann, 124.
- „ Isabella, 124.
- Zeffiri Silvio (physician), 573 n. 3.
- Zephirus, Petrus Ventura (architect), 586 n. 1.
- Zerbini, Giulia, 88.
- Zerbolt, Gerard, of Zutphen (a brother of the Common Life), 16.
- Zorilla, Alfonso (theologian), 242.
- Zuccherò, Federigo (painter), 574.
- Zumárraga, Juan de (Archbishop of Mexico), 516.

LIBRARY OF HISTORICAL WORKS

ON

THE CATHOLIC MIDDLE AGES AND AFTER.

HISTORY OF THE POPES FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and other original sources. From the German of Dr LUDWIG PASTOR, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Edited, as to Vols. I.-VI., by the late FREDERICK IGNATIUS ANTROBUS, and, as to Vols. VII.-XII., by FRANCIS RALPH KERR, of the London Oratory. In Fourteen Volumes (12 now ready). Demy 8vo.

Pope Innocent III. acceded in 1199, and Dr Pastor, in his Introductory Volume (Vol. I. of the "History"), following on the work designed and nearly brought to completion by Father Mann, gives an outline of the lives of the Popes during the Avignon period and during the period of the Great Schism. The History starts with Martin V. (1417-1431), and extends through several centuries. To English readers, Vols. IX. and X. are, perhaps, of more than ordinary interest, since they deal, *inter alia*, with the negotiations between Henry VIII. and the Pope in the matter of the Royal Divorce. Vols. XI. and XII. deal with the pontificate of Paul III., and discusses the Diet of Worms, the Society of Jesus, the German Schism, and the Council of Trent. Vols. XIII. and XIV., concluding this monumental undertaking, will be ready in the course of 1914.

"The work is of the first importance, and must long remain indispensable for those who wish to obtain a thorough knowledge of the life of the centre of Christianity at the time of its greatest convulsion. Dr Pastor's vast knowledge of the printed literature of his subject, in itself, far surpasses that of any other writer, but his work is made of unique value by his use of the secret archives of the Vatican, and other original sources, which have hitherto been inaccessible."—*The Guardian*.

"Dr Pastor has two chief advantages. He has found an extraordinarily good translator, and—what is more important—he has so much historical judgment that, Roman Catholic though he be, and handling the story of his foes, he endeavours to approach the characters he deals with without bias and to sum up with sense and insight."—*The Times*.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

ACTA INEDITA Historiam Pontificum Romanorum præsertim sæc. xv., xvi., xvii. Illustrantia. Vol. I. 1376-1464. Demy 8vo.

HISTORY OF ROME AND THE POPES IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

By HARTMANN GRISAR, S.J., Professor at the University of Innsbruck. Authorised English Translation, edited by LUIGI CAPPADelta. In Three Volumes. Royal 8vo. Profusely Illustrated with maps, plans, and photographs of basilicas, mosaics, coins, and other memorials.

"The present work might be described as a history of the mediæval Popes, with the history of the City of Rome and of its civilisation as a background, the author's design being so to combine the two stories as to produce a true picture of what Rome was in the Middle Ages."—*Author's Preface*.

The three volumes now issued represent Vol. I. in the bulky German original. This portion of Father Grisar's great enterprise is self-contained, and the history is brought down to the epoch of St Gregory I.

"A valuable and interesting book, well translated . . . will, we are sure, be welcomed by all students and lovers of Rome, whether Catholics or not."—*The Tablet*.

"Scholars of every school of thought will welcome its appearance, and will admire, even while occasionally criticising, the boundless wealth of facts it contains."—*The Outlook*.

THE LIVES OF THE POPES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES.

By the Rev. HORACE K. MANN, Headmaster of St Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Vols. I.-VIII. now ready. (Vol. I. in Two Parts.) Vols. IV.-VIII. are Illustrated. Demy 8vo.

Father Mann starts his *magnum opus* where the third volume of Grisar leaves off, at the Pontificate of St Gregory the Great. The subject-matter of his first eight volumes are:—I. The Popes under the Lombard Rule; II. The Popes during the Carolingian Empire; III. The same, continued; IV. The Popes in the Days of Feudal Anarchy; V. The same, continued; VI. The Popes of the Gregorian Renaissance; VII. and VIII. The same, continued. Vols. IX. and X., to be published in 1913, will deal with the Popes from Innocent II. (1130) to Innocent III. (1198).

"Shows fully the dispassionate reasoning of an impartial critic, and the clear, lucid style of a well-read scholar."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"The pictures are well drawn, the political and ecclesiastical situations well described, the lights and shadows ably defined, and the reading made easy and pleasant."—*Dublin Review*.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

BX Pastor, Ludwig, Freiherr von
955 The history of the popes, from
P35 the close of the Middle Ages
1898
v.12

