THE JESUITS:

THEIR HISTORY, CONSTITUTION, MORAL TEACHING, POLITICAL PRINCIPLES, RELIGION, AND SCIENCE.

BY

DR. OTTO HENNE AM RHYN.

NEW YORK:

Reproduced in electronic form
2002

Bank of Wisdom®
A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY
P.O. Box 926
Louisville, KY 40201
U.S.A.

The purpose of the Bank of Wisdom is to again make the United States the Free Marketplace of Ideas that the **American Founding Fathers** originally meant this Nation to be.

Emmett F. Fields
Bank of Wisdom.

CONTENTS.

THE JESUITS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE JESUITS.

That the opposition, in Germany and Switzerland, to the repeal of the Jesuit laws springs solely or chiefly out of fear of the Jesuits on the part of Protestants, we hold to be entirely erroneous: nay, such opinion involves a total misconception of the German character. Not only Protestants, save such of them as have been won over to Rome or are moving in that direction, but also educated Catholics who are not in any way dependent on the Ultramontane party, are enemies of the Society of Jesus on principle: such Catholics, however, if they care to remain in the Church of Rome must not speak out, because for a good while or ever since Pius IX. renounced his liberal opinions (1849), that church

has been dominated by the Jesuits. This hatred of Jesuits has nothing in common with fear or apprehension: it is a healthy inborn Germanic hatred for a society that with the greatest persistence has ever combated and depreciated whatever is held dear and sacred by the German nation as a whole. And this is positively no question of Protestantism, though it was the Jesuits that reduced the numerical strength of Protestantism in Germany in the 16th and 17th centuries from being nine-tenths of the population to one half. Nor does this enmity toward the Jesuit order imply any depreciation of the services rendered by Jesuits in the propagation of the Christian religion, or in various departments of science, or in the care of the poor and the sick, etc. The thing that is attacked is the Jesuit system, which in the first place is thoroughly hostile to the progress of science in the broad sense of the term, secondly to freedom of thought, and thirdly to Germanic civilization. We say nothing here of morality, though most of the Jesuits who have written on morals with permission of superiors, favor the immoral principle of Probabilism; because the maxim, "the end justifies the means"—a too free version of their distinctive principle—is accepted by most non-Jesuits and even by many anti-Jesuits. But it is to be remembered that the Jesuits were the authors of the papal "Syllabus," which anathematizes all the achievements of modern civilization and in particular the independence of states and the freedom of conscience; that the Jesuits still hold fast the belief in devils, witches, and sorcerers; and that it is by the Jesuits that the already too materialistic faith of the unlettered classes is made still more materialistic and base by the cult of the "sacred heart" and other senseless forms of devotion.

To obtain a correct notion of the history of the rise of

the Jesuit order, we must glance at the general history of Christian nations prior to that event: without such retrospect the history of the Jesuits cannot be understood.

Christianity, at its introduction into Europe, found already existing the antagonism of the Germanic and the Romanic peoples—the Romanic without a common descent, and held together only by the language and culture of Rome: the Germanic of one common stock, with its native vigor unimpaired by the overrefinement of Rome and the degeneracy of Roman morals and Roman vices. It was inevitable that Christianity should assume among the Romans and Germans respectively forms as diverse as it did among the races of Grecian speech and culture in eastern Europe and in western Asia. But whereas the nations of Grecian origin occupied a territory apart, the Germanic and Romanic races, after the great migration of nations, lived not only side by side, but also, in part, intermingled with each other. Wherever the latter situation existed the Germanic and Romanic ideas of Christianity of course permeated each other; but wherever the two stocks lived apart, the specific ideas of each asserted supremacy. In the Scandinavian North the memories of Germanic heathenism survived for a long time, and were collected in the "Edda" even under the dominance of the Christian religion. In Germany these memories were effaced by the Romanic apostles, especially by the Romanized Anglosaxon Boniface, save a few remnants that were fixed in the fireside tales, and in popular usages; nevertheless most of the days of the week continued to be named after the Aesir of the Scandinavian mythology. So too in the Romanic lands the week-days retained the names of Roman gods, and that with the Church's consent; and Roman morals and manners persisted in

many instances, though modified by Christianity.

After the great emperor Karl (Charlemagne), in spite of many a blemish, one of the foremost heroes of civilization in the world's history, had turned his attention to the ancient Teutonic traditions, those traditions again took root among the Germanic nations, unhindered by the zealous efforts of his son Louis the Pious for their suppression. Although these nations, with the entire West, acknowledged the primacy of Rome, because it was the fashion to regard Rome as the capital of the world, nevertheless they maintained their right to their own conception of Christianity. The imperial power, which they had made fast to their own race stock, gave to the Germanic spirit (Germanism, Teutonism) a standing over against the Romanic Papacy, and in the "Roman empire of the German nation" (Imperium romanum nationis germanicae) asserted its superiority over the Romanic popedom, till the weak Henry IV., crowned in his childhood by his own evil fortune, came to the throne; but after its decline under that weakling Germanism rose again under the vigorous Hohenstaufens. During the Middle Age German poetry in its masterpieces shows itself independent of Romanic influences. In the "Heljand" though that poem was written in the time of Louis the Pious, Christ appears not as a pope, cardinal, or bishop, but, as a kingly hero, his disciples as his royal train, and the last supper as a banquet of heroes. In vain do we seek in it for manifestations of extreme Christian lowliness; and the ideas of heathendom are treated as gently as possible. In the grand epic, the Nibelungenlied, of the Hohenstaufen era, there is very little that is Christian, and the Papacy has no place at all. But still more striking is the total absence of reference to the Roman hierarchy in "Parcifal," a poem full of devout Christian sentiment.

Even the Trinity of the Godhead is not named; the mystery of the atoning death of the Son of God is guarded, not by a priest in a church, but by knights in an enchanted castle; and a "paynim," i. e. a Moslem, is brother of the Christian hero.

In the dreadful Kaiserless times (after the excommunication and deposal of Henry IV.) the splendor of that empire in which men in those times recognized a universal Christian Kingdom, was made naught. The alliance of a part of the German nation with the Papacy against the Empire, i. e. with Romanism against Germanism, had brought about this lamentable incident in a glorious history. But the Papacy found in the result little cause of rejoicing: simultaneously the Church began to show signs of dissolution. Satiric allusions to the Papacy and the clergy were to be seen in the work of sculptors even in Gothic cathedrals. A number of sects sprung up, all aiming at the restoration of primitive Christian simplicity in the place of Roman hierarchism. At last, in the fourteenth century the Papacy was split up into hostile factions under three or four popes. A universal reaction had set in against the efforts not only of the Church, but of the State also, for unity.

The separation of Church and State reached its consummation at the Schism of the church, or Reformation. The politico-religious movement of the sixteenth century which we call "the Reformation" was no sudden occurrence happening at that moment unexpectedly, by which the Church of Christ was wickedly and maliciously rent asunder; it simply marked a period in the history of the opposition to the system that had become dominant in the Church, and to creeds imposed by force—an opposition that had been persistently maintained from the earliest ages of Christianity, and that had found

forcible expression among statesmen and churchmen, among scholars and artists, but especially among the adherents of the numerous sects. Nor did the reformers concoct the Reformation so that they might take wives, as is often alleged: though surely the desire of marriage is nothing censurable, nay rather must appear highly virtuous in view of the concubinage so prevalent among the clergy shortly before the Reformation, when priests could, without marrying, indulge every lustful desire, as is fully established by contemporary documents and by the statements of writers of the times who were strict Catholics, as Sebastian Brant, Thomas Murner, Erasmus, and others. The fact is that at the Reformation the revolt of the Germanic spirit against the now dominant Romanic element had reached its height and an outbreak was inevitable. Respect for the Church had fallen so low, because of her corruption in the fifteenth century, that with the new movement were associated all kinds of excesses, each aiming to remedy the existing evils in a way of its own. The ancient authority of the Church was wrecked, chiefly by her own fault, and no new authority had taken its place. This state of things wrought mischief as well in the political field through the bloody war of the peasants (1525) as in the religious field through disastrous schisms. Sundry remnants of those sects which during the Middle Age had striven to keep alive the ideas of primitive Christianity and who had been persecuted as heretics, refused scornfully to join the Reformation, because the reformers wanted a state church instead of a free congregational church; hence they were mercilessly put down by both Catholic and Protestant governments. To these sectaries—erroneously called Anabaptists because, after the example of the early Christians, they baptized not children but only

adults—flocked the worst elements of the population; and thus was the cause of free religion brought into disrepute in the minds of after generations by the religio-political fury of those people. But there was one act in the Anabaptist drama which marked the culmination of their insanity, namely the founding of the "Kingdom of Zion" in the Westphalian city of Münster —a kingdom which had so bloody an ending. And this fact appears to us all the more worthy of remark, because here we see insanity aiming to realize the selfsame fundamental idea which the Jesuits afterward realized with consummate sagacity, namely, the founding of a spiritual kingdom designed to comprise all mankind.

CHAPTER II.

FOUNDING OF THE JESUIT ORDER: ITS GROWTH.

So great was the advance of the Protestant cause during the struggles of the Reformation era, that its Roman opponent became alarmed, and the fall of its spiritual empire was ever before its eyes as a terrifying phantom. The question then was for Rome, To be or not to be—to do or die. But for effective action she had need of an aggressive force armed with the sword of the spirit. The Papacy was not, such a force; for the popes who immediately preceded as well as those who reigned during the period of schism, had, by their

weakness, frivolity, avarice, and want of principle, disgraced the See of Peter in the sight of all Christendom. Hence the weapons to be employed against the advance of Protestantism had to come from a different arsenal from that upon the Tiber—from believing Spain, which had just happily ended an 800-year war against the enemies of Christianity, and which was therefore still fervid in zeal, and in its religious belief untouched by the skepticism of the age. The devout chivalry of that fanatic country produced the hero whose mission was, if not by his personal efforts, then by those of his Institute, to revive Catholicism, to reconquer many of its lost provinces, and to re-establish the tottering chair of St. Peter.

If the ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote, knight of the rueful countenance, instead of being a figment of the brain of Cervantes had actually lived and had founded according to his own fancy an order of knights which should, under the direction of more realistic successors, assume practical shape, such a phenomenon were not more marvelous than the Society of Jesus—the resuscitation, under a new form better adapted to the age, of monkery which was supposed to be dead and buried in consequence of the Reformation. The founder of that institute, Inigo (Ignatius) Lopez de Recalde, born 1491 in the castle of Loyola (whence his surname) in the Basque province of Guipuzcoa, was severely wounded in the defense of Pampelona against the French 1521, and after a risky operation on a shattered leg was lame for life. Thus rendered incapable of military service, he was, by reading the lives of saints while confined in bed, transformed into a soldier of God and the Virgin. Quite naturally, under the excitement of this reading he had visions in his fever dreams, the Virgin appearing to him with the infant Jesus. In their honor he renounced all worldly lusts and vowed himself to a godly

life. As knight of Mary he kept vigil one night before her miraculous image on Montserrat, a mountain near Barcelona; in the morning he suspended his sword from the altar, gave away his secular garb and all his money, and wrapped him round in sackcloth with a thick cord as girdle. He now lived a vagabond beggar; fasted, prayed, scourged himself, wore around his body an iron chain and a girdle of thorns; and by dint of these mortifications reached such a state that at the mass when the priest elevated the host Ignatius clearly discerned therein the body and blood of Christ. He had frequent ecstasies and visions; evangelized the people, converted sinners, adopted the famous motto "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam" (to God's greater glory); pilgrimed to the Holy Land, and on his return began, though 33 years of age, to learn Latin, and studied philosophy at Alcala and theology at Salamanca. But the sciences, with the "poison" contained in them, gave offense to his devout spirit, and his religious zeal brought him under suspicion of heresy with the Inquisition: at both Alcala and Salamanca he was imprisoned, but was released after a few weeks, nothing having been discovered to his prejudice. He must have seen that there was nothing for him to do in Spain, that foe of all innovation; he therefore set out afoot for Paris. At Paris he took up his studies again, beginning at the beginning (for the requirements there were more strict than in Spain); here again he was denounced to the Dominicans' Inquisition, but was not brought to trial. He now gathered to himself six young men, three of them Spaniards, one a Portuguese, one a Navarrese, and one a Savoyard. These enlisted for his project of going to Jerusalem, and if that were not feasible, of offering themselves to the Pope, to be sent by him whithersoever he would. On the feast of the Assumption, 1534, in

the crypt chapel of the church of Montmartre, after receiving the communion and pronouncing the three monastic vows, they pledged themselves in common to carry out the project. Such was the solemn and mystic founding of the Society of Jesus. Without a moment's delay its founders set about their work of confirming the Catholics in the faith, leading back the doubters into the bosom of the Church and strengthening them against the "heretical plague of the time," as the Reformation is designated by the historian and encomiast of the Jesuits, Professor Buss. Friends in Spain, men and women, as is shown by the letters of Ignatius, provided in abundance all things needed. At Venice the brethren saw their number increased to ten by the accession of a Savoyard and two Frenchmen. Every day on the route they heard mass and communicated, and they everywhere wore the rosary beads around the neck as a public profession of their faith in heretical localities. The war emergencies of the time hindered their journey to the Holy Land; so they presented themselves before Pope Paul III. (the first real pope since the outbreak of the religious revolt), who gave them encouragement and support. Those of them who before were not priests were now ordained, but they traversed Italy in ragged garb and distinguished themselves from the body of the clergy by the extreme austerity of their lives. In 1537 they decided to settle in Rome, and Loyola gave to his society the name "Company of Jesus," thus signifying that it was designed to be a battalion of Christian soldiers in the service of Jesus and his vicegerent on earth. In Rome where they were received with very scant favor, being persecuted and opposed by the pampered clergy, and even denounced as heretics, the first Jesuits had the sense to trust in their founder's energetic character and his ready eloquence as a defense against

their enemies. From Paul III. they received signal tokens of approval, whereupon they added to the three customary vows a fourth, of unconditional devotion to the Pope. Among the cardinals they still had some enemies; but certain princely patrons worked for them, and on the 27th of September 1540 the Pope gave in the bull "Regimini Militantis Ecclesiae" his sanction to the Constitution of the Society drafted by Loyola. "The aim of the Society," says a recent writer, "was to battle against heresy with every possible means—by preaching, by teaching, by publishing works on literary, scientific, and political subjects." "My idea," said Loyola, "is not that I have given up military service but that I have transferred it to God." Of course Ignatius was immediately chosen as the Society's first General. At the election he himself cast a blank ballot, and was sufficiently assurred that his formal declination would not be accepted. He lived entirely for the end he had proposed to himself, and rejected all other aims. Being a man of purest moral character he surely had no thought of the extravagant principles which later were published by so many of his disciples; yet he laid the foundation of such maxims in his saying that "exceptional prudence, joined with middling sanctity, is of more account than a greater sanctity with less prudence." For Loyola was not only an ideal enthusiast but also a shrewd man of affairs; and in admitting new members he used, as his secretay Polanco informs us, to prize more highly stability of character, business capacity, a good understanding, worldly wisdom, and a pleasing exterior, than goodness and piety; and in his later years he not only quit the use of the discipline himself, but dissuaded therefrom his foremost colaborers in the most express terms.

The Society of Jesus, after its approval by the

Pope, grew rapidly. Loyola from the first impressed on it a strictly international character. He permitted no member to live in his own country, but sent his disciples into foreign lands where they would be freed from all ties of kindred or of friendship. Six years after the order was founded it numbered already several hundred members, and had its representatives in all countries; and this though it had in many lands to contend against a popular prejudice fanned by the jealousy of other religious orders and of the secular clergy.

Even in Spain, the founder's native land, the order met with resolute opposition. The Dominicans called the Jesuits (by whom they deemed their own consequence as inquisitors menaced) forerunners of Anti-Christ. Alcala and Salamanca were zealous opponents of the institute founded by their alumnus. The Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo inhibited them from hearing confessions; in Saragossa they were mobbed. It was Francis Borgia, duke of Gandia, himself a member of the order, that made peace between Spain and her son.

In France the Sorbonne (the Paris theological faculty) in 1554 condemned the Society and declared it to be "a menace to the faith; calculated to disturb the peace of the Church, to overthrow the monastic orders, and fitted rather for destruction than for edification." At length, however, Catholic France recognized in the Jesuits its trustiest confederates in the struggle with Protestantism, and tolerated them.

The number of adherents of the order was restricted to sixty in the bull of institution; but Loyola did not stand at that, taking the sixty to mean so many Professi or members in the highest grade. The complaisant Pope, however, who knew the value of this army as against the Reformation, annulled the restriction in

1543, and thereafter loaded the society with privileges.

"In 1545 he conferred on the order the largest faculties for reservation of the eucharist, hearing confessions, and absolving penitents in all quarters of the world, also for preaching. Two years later he freed the Jesuits in perpetuity from the obligation of directing convents of nuns. October 18th 1549 by the bull "Licet Debitum" once for all he granted to them all the privileges of the monastic orders, particularly the faculty of imparting absolution to all their members and subjects for all and singular their sins which were by the canon law reserved to the Holy See. This latter faculty regularly would be in abeyance during the jubilee year, but Pope Julius III. allowed an exception in favor of the Jesuits: for them this restriction was never to stand. In 1551 the Pope threatened with the greater excommunication and all the penalties consequent thereon, all persons whosoever should impugn the rules, rights and privileges of the Society, or who should hinder its members in the lawful exercise of their functions."(M. Philippson, Westeuropa in dem Zeitalter von Philipp II. Berlin 1882. Compare Cretineau-Joly, Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus).

By promising the help of the order, as also by the use of flattery and a submissive deportment, as related by the Jesuit Orlandino, historian of the Society, Loyola won the favor of the Catholic princes and potentates. His letters show that he did not scruple to propose and to urge upon those in authority a division of the property of other religious orders between the princes and his Society. This was tried in Bavaria, and a like offer was made to Charles V. with regard to Spain; but the scheme failed through the Emperor's aversion for whatever would prejudice his sovereign rights. In the mid-

dle of the century was established at Rome the first educational institute of the order, the Collegio Romano, which within five years of its being founded sent one hundred of its alumni into every quarter of the globe. In the meantime the Collegium Germanicum was also founded, with the object of counteracting by the aid of Germans the reformatory movement in Germany, where already nine-tenths of the people had gone over to the Protestant cause.

Such being the situation, Germany must needs be the chief objective point of the Jesuits' struggle for the restoration of the ancient creed. But their success was neither complete nor speedy, nor was it won by their own efforts alone: it was only partial, was won very slowly, and with the help of other instrumentalities, whether spiritual or, as was most largely the case, mundane.

The Society was still young. Loyola the enthusiast was still living (he died 1556) and no Escobar, Sanchez, Vasquez, Busembaum had yet written their peculiar moral treatises, when the new Institute was planted in Germany: there the Catholic party regarded the Society in all good faith as the prop of the Church. In 1551 the Jesuits under the patronage of Ferdinand I., king of the Romans, founded their college at Vienna, in 1554–56 the colleges at Cologne, Ingolstadt and Prague, in 1559 that at Munich, in 1561 those at Treves and Mayence; and in 1556, mainly through the indefatigable industry of the Dutchman Peter de Hondt, known to us as Canisius, they had spread a great net over the whole of Bavaria, Tyrol, Franconia, Suabia, the greater part of Austria, and the Rhine countries; and were on the eve of settling in Hungary. Ingolstadt was the focus of Jesuit scholarship, the rays of which dazzled the eyes of the short-sighted. Even the Protestants

suffered themselves to be cajoled, and sent their sons to the Jesuits. Wherever they got foothold they forthwith brought back again the almost obsolete relics of saints, rosaries, fasts, and pilgrimages. It was a military expedition of the Roman-Catholic spirit into the domain of German and Protestant culture.

The results appeared first in Bavaria. Duke Albert V., previously inclined to make concessions to his people (a majority of whom had embraced Protestantism), at the close of the Council of Trent suddenly turned against the Protestants, sent Jesuits among them as a proselytizing army, and wherever they remained true to their faith drove them into banishment. Quantities of the books named in the "Index Expurgatorius" were burned, and Jesuit books spread abroad instead. But the Duke did not limit himself to his own dominion. His ward, Philip II., son of Philibert, margrave of Baden-Baden, who had died in France in the ranks of the Huguenots, was by his command brought up in the Catholic faith; and in the two years 1570–71 he procured the conversion of the people of the margravate to the ancient creed by his Jesuits. At the same time Canisius was commissioned to visit the Catholic princes, to exhort them to united action, unconditional acceptance of the Tridentine decrees, and denial of any concessions to the Protestants. His efforts were crowned with success: clerical seminaries sprang up everywhere: in the Catholic universities beginning with Dillingen, no candidate was now admitted to degrees without signing the Tridentine confession of faith; and the same subscription was required of all schoolmasters in the bishopric of Treves. The ecclesiastical princes, previously so indifferent, now appeared in every church procession, at every vesper service. Daniel Brendel, elector of Mayence, till then tolerant, went forth now, with Jesuit

assistance, conquering, expelled the Protestant preachers from his Saxon possessions in Eichsfeld, and put Jesuits in their stead. The abbot of Fulda acted in the same way. Imperial privileges, pleaded by the Protestants, were everywhere disregarded. This aroused the Protestants to resistance. In the domain of Fulda the doughty abbot was set upon by his nobles and compelled to abdicate, 1576. A noteworthy attempt at withstanding the Catholic movement—and it was an attempt that required no little courage—was made by Gebhard Truchsess, archbishop of Cologne, on taking possession of that see 1577. Truchsess openly confessed a leaning toward Protestantism; he never performed the mass; he meditated transforming his electorate into a secular and hereditary princedom. He actually declared his purpose of turning Protestant and marrying, and herein he had the backing of the Count Palatine John Casimir: but in 1583 they both succumbed to the power of the Pope and the arms of Bavaria and Spain; Truchsess had to flee and to give place to the Bavarian Prince Ernest, a young man of dissolute life, who already possessed four bishoprics. Henry von Lauenburg, Bishop of Paderborn and Osnabrück, who had been inclined to follow the example of Truchsess, died 1585 by a fall from his horse. Jesuits, backed by armed force, swarmed into the jurisdictions of these two bishops, and afterward into Münster in Westphalia, Hildesheim, and other districts. Julius bishop of Würzburg converted his capital and the appurtenant territory to Catholicism by force; and the bishop of Bamberg followed his example: in both dioceses monasteries were again filled with monks and nuns. In the free city of Cologne attendance at Protestant preaching was punished with fine and imprisonment; in Augsburg and Regensburg the Protestants were visited with banish-

ment. Nay, the papal nuncio and the Jesuits and their understrappers even made attempts to convert Protestant princes in Saxony, Hesse, and the Palatinate, and with the princes their people; and strenuous efforts were made to purge the imperial supreme court of its Protestant members. Disciples of the Jesuits climbed into the places of the ecclesiastical princes, and then with fearful conscientiousness did away every remnant of Protestantism.

The carrying out of this system encountered greatest difficulty in Austria, but precisely in that country was the process of conversion most ruthless and bloody. The Reformation had spread widely over Austria, and the University of Vienna was for the South of Germany a focus of Protestantism as Wittenberg for the North. High officials favored the Reformation, and the monasteries were many of them deserted. In vain were draconian decrees, threatening death by fire and water, published by the government at the instigation of the bishops. The diet of Austria was almost wholly Protestant; in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola the nobility zealously promoted the new doctrine, and Protestantism was in the ascendant. Nay, in Tyrol the tendency toward the reformed religion degenerated into a furious peasant revolt, tinctured with anabaptistry; but the tendency was put down, and first of all in the hereditary dominions, with the sword, the scaffold, and the stake. In Bohemia, Hussitism, its embers still glimmering, was transformed into the most pronounced Lutheranism; but it warred with no less zeal for the triumph of the Czech language than for that of the new doctrine.

At the middle of the 16th century hardly one-tenth of the population of Austria, and of upper Austria hardly one-twentieth, was Catholic. Even monasteries

gave stipends to Austrian youths studying at Wittenberg. Still it is to be remarked that Austrian Protestantism was narrow, intolerant, a slave of the letter; nevertheless its agencies effected much good in the way of instruction and works of benevolence. The Suabian humanist Nicodemus Frischlin labored with abundant good results at Laibach, though only for a short time.

The Protestant cause received a blow in the death of the Emperor Maximilian II., who had at first favored it, but afterward turned against it, yet did not resort to oppressive measures. The Jesuits, held in check during his reign, regained their former influence, and now with their obscurantist outfit of sermons and confraternities, and with the support of the most zealously Catholic archdukes, and of the learned and esthetic Rudolf II. (who however did not understand the popular mind) proceeded to wage ruthless war for the suppression of Protestantism. In 1578 the University of Vienna was forcibly detached from the cause of the Reformation, and after a stubborn resistance was in 1610 passed over to the Jesuits absolutely. The common people were constrained by brute force, the nobility were brought by gentle means, to profess the faith of Rome according to the catechism of the Jesuit Canisius.

There were many revolts of the peasantry in the latter part of the 16th century, against this compulsion of belief, but they were mercilessly put down. The spirit of the kindred Spanish royal house had become fully dominant in the house of Austria, and its rage suffered only a brief intermission when, in the rivalry of brothers, Matthias, for political reasons, again guaranteed toleration to the Protestants, in order to receive their homage.

The victory of the Jesuits in Austria was made

decisive by their pupil and unconditional devotee, afterward styled Ferdinand II. While yet archduke of Styria he visited Rome, and there in 1598, falling at the Pope's feet, promised that he would make the Catholic religion the sole dominant religion of that province; and he kept his word. Thereupon he had his portrait painted in the Capuchins' church at Gratz, in the character of the Archangel Michael conquering the Devil in the form of Martin Luther. Carinthia and Carniola came next. It was the fashion of that time to give the name of "reformation" to the tearing down of Protestant churches and banishing their preachers, and to the wrecking of Protestant schools and burning of Protestant books. The Emperor Rudolf in 1601 took a like course in Upper and Lower Austria, nay, in the Kingdom of Bohemia and Hungary, though these countries enjoyed laws of their own. An Italian Augustin friar succeeded in preventing the allowance by the Emperor of the prayer of the Protestant princes that the Jesuits should be forbidden to write against the religious peace of 1555; so the Protestants seceded from the imperial diet, 1608, and founded the "Union." The following year the Catholic princes united in the "League," and thus was occasion given for the disastrous thirty-years war. The cause of the Reformation in Bohemia suffered a death blow in the defeat at the White Mountain (November 8, 1620), and in Austria itself through the suppression of the peasants' revolt under Stephen Fadinger by the Catholic "army of saviors" (Seligmacher). Nevertheless hundreds of thousands of Austrians, indeed the best elements of the population—nobles, townspeople, and peasants—escaped a cruel persecution by emigrating to Saxony, Brandenburg, Switzerland and other countries. In Austrian lands there were left only Jesuits, a fanatical

soldiery, and a downtrodden commonalty sunk in gross superstition.

CHAPTER III.

SUPPRESSION AND RESTORATION OF THÉ SOCIETY.

In the 17th century and in the beginning of the 18th the Jesuits exercised the highest powers they have ever possessd.

With incredible astuteness, exchanging the pious enthusiasm of their founder for wise calculation, they contrived to insinuate themselves into all manner of concernments, as confessors to Kings and their consorts, to ministers of state, and to military commanders; as professors in universities and principals of high schools; as missionaries among the heathen and founders of colonies. They understood the art of winning over the world to themselves in the pulpit and the confessional, in drawing-rooms, in the sick-chamber as well as amid scenes of gayety; they accomodated themselves to the opinions of all: among Protestants were tolerant, in China palmed off Buddhism for Catholic worship; were enthusiastic with enthusiasts, sportive with the wordly; argued with the visionary, and comforted the downcast. Be it fully admitted that during the thirty-years war they rendered good service in alleviating the miseries

of that time, and that in several great pestilences they cared for the stricken with great self-devotion.

But an evil day dawned on the Society when in the the latter half of the 18th century the so called "era of enlightenment" set in. In Catholic countries this movement (Illuminism) naturally took a direction opposed to the Papacy. At first the extreme west of the European continent was in the lead of the movement: it was in little Portugal that Catholic Liberalism so called made its debut, and the name that is coupled with its appearance there is that of Sebastian Joseph de Carvalho y Melo, afterward Count of Oeyras and finally Marquis of Pombal. While yet simply a page at the court of King John I. he was noted for his continual planning and contriving, and hence was sent on diplomatic errands to London and Vienna, though only with the result of making him more familiar with European, and particularly with French Illuminism. By favor of his Queen he was called home as minister of state 1750; and the King dying soon after, Pombal now ruled Portugal in the name of John's successor, Joseph, a minor, a sensualist, and a slave of superstition. Having from the first decided to play the part of a reforming dictator, Pombal still followed the example of the other 18th century reformers; he began many enterprises and brought few to completion; he had no regard for consequences, acknowledged no restrictions, and hence the result was a mixture of good and evil. His first attack was directed against the Jesuits, who at that time were supreme in Portugal, and whom he hated above all things. Occasion was given for this attack by the moral maxims of the Jesuits, notorious especially since the publication of Pascal's letters; also by the secular dominion set up by the Jesuits among the Indians of Paraguay in Spanish and Portguese territory; and by

Father Lavalette's ugly commercial speculations in the West Indies, whereby in 1756 several of the greatest mercantile houses of France suffered heavy losses. The Socicty offered to make good these losses by masses for the dead, but was adjudged by the Paris parlement in 1760 to make restitution, and was debarred from all commercial business. In the same spirit Pope Benedict XIV. had already (February 1741), by his bull "Apostolicae Servitutis," interdicted to the regular clergy all commercial and industrial business, all acquisition of secular dominion, and all buying and selling of converted Indians; and in the bull "Immensa Pastorum" of the same year had condemned the doings of the Jesuits in distant lands, and their disobedience to the bull of February; they were forbidden under pain of excommunication to make slaves of Indians, to sell or to barter them, to separate them from wife and children, to deprive them of their property or to take them away from their homes —all which things they had previously been doing. (Bullarium Benedicti XIV., t. i, p. 101). This bull hit especially the Jesuit State in Paraguay, the patriarchal government of which attracted so much attention at that time, being now praised in unmeasured terms even by Illuminees, anon as strongly condemned.

When the Indians, blindly obedient to their Jesuit superiors, rose in arms under Jesuit command against an exchange of territories in Paraguay between Spain and Portugal, Pombal (1753–55) despatched an army to South America with instructions strictly to execute the before mentioned papal bull and to make an end of the Jesuit State. Nor did the Lisbon earthquake of 1755 and the terrible calamity thereby produced retard the carrying out of his plans. He did away the autos de fe, curtailed the power of the Court of Inquisition, reserved to the secular tribunals the power of inflicting punishment,

limited the right of monastic houses to admit novices. And if these measures were aimed at the Church, Pombal on the other hand struck a blow at the noblesse by annulling the graces whereby the crown had enriched great families with estates in the Portuguese possessions over sea. Any manifestation of discontent with the ordinances of the powerful minister was punished with imprisonment or even with death, and there was a veritable reign of terror. In the meantime the flourishing Jesuit State in Paraguay was being conquered with fire and sword. To relieve the distress caused by the earthquake, Pombal opened the government magazines of grain, prohibited the export of farm products, lifted the tariff on their importation, and ordered the water conduits, destroyed by the earthquake, to be restored; the robber bands that arose out of the public calamities he suppressed by summary executions. As the clergy were violently denouncing Pombal as the author of the earthquake, and striving to gain influence over the King, Pombal banished from the court Father Malagrida, the most influential Jesuit in Portugal, and then all other Jesuits, whom he removed by force, having obtained the bigoted king's approval of the measure by assuring him that his royal person was in danger from the Jesuits, and that in Pombal alone could he find a defender. To foreign powers he justified his act in a letter written in his own name. He asked of the Pope a reform of the Society, and the reform was duly ordered 1758. Cardinal Saldanha, who was commissioned to execute the reform, forbade to the Jesuits all trading, also excluded them from the pulpit and the confessional. An attempt on the life of the king, contrived by a family two of whose female members had been debauched by him, though with the connivance of their husbands, gave occasion

to Pombal for wreaking a terrible vengeance on the family as also on the Jesuits; they were intimate friends of the family, and their houses were kept under surveillance. After an investigation carried on with the aid of the torture and other cruelties, came the terrible spectacle of the executions. The belongings of the Jesuits were attached, and the protests of the Pope, the cardinals, and of hundreds of bishops were vain. Then (1759) Pombal ordered 113 Jesuits to be put on board a ship and transported to Rome, and all members of the Society to be banished from Portugal under pain of death. Soon there was a second cargo, nor was mercy shown to any though in their number were many aged and feeble men. Next Pombal picked a quarrel with the nuncio and, 1760, had him conveyed to the frontier by a troop of dragoons. Malagrida, as presumptive author of the attempted assassination, though he was now a feeble old man, was given up to the Dominicans by the enlightened minister, and by them was burned as a heretic. These terrible doings—terrible, though, except the last, they served the cause of enlightenment, were defended and justified by Pombal in fugitive pieces which though they were not read at home, were by the favor of Kaunitz published and commented on in the newspapers of Austria. The revolutionary minister next set about providing a better educational system to take the place of the Jesuits' system. He contemplated the establishment of common schools, of which there were hardly any, a reform of the University of Coimbra, the founding of a new college for the education of the sons of the gentry, and of an industrial school for the compulsory training of indolent apprentices. He abolished monopolies, made the grain trade a function of the state, and declared all slaves brought into Portugal from foreign countries freemen. He reformed several

of the monastic orders, retrenched holidays, and patronized literature and the book trade though he let the censorship remain—a censorship according to his own heart, however. Curiously enough, he extended like favor to the Inquisition, nay even to the autos de fe, but the autos were never practiced after the death of Malagrida. Pombal did much also for the advancement of agriculture, trade, and commerce, for the adornment and the sanitation of the capital city, but nothing toward providing better dwellings for the poor. Yet with all these reforms Portugal languished under the most fearful despotism, a despotism all the more unjustifiable as it purported to be enlightened. The prisons were glutted with convicts, and the surplus was transported to the deadly climates of Africa and of Brazil. A political inquisition planted distrust in all ranks of society. In 1777, the king lying dangerously ill, Pombal, who foresaw the fortune that awaited him, gave in his resignation and surrendered to the state a full treasury. The king was succeeded by his daughter Mary I. who under papal dispensation married her uncle, just as her son afterward married her sister. The queen being very devout, even superstitious, annulled Pombal's reforms one after another, and freed from prison all his victims. She could not recall the Jesuits, the Society having been in the meantime suppressed by the Pope. There was no lack of strong charges against the retired minister. His written defense was publicly burned. Pombal died 1782.

Portugal's example in persecuting the Jesuits had a notably stimulative influence on the countries then ruled by the house of Bourbon, in all other respects so strictly Catholic; it seemed as though the spirit of their ancestor Henry IV. had decended again upon his progeny or rather upon the ministers of state.

France led. We have already mentioned the case of Lavalette, the outcome of which was that the Society was juridically outlawed, though it was still recognized by the government. By the judgment of the parlement all bulls protecting the Jesuits and certain other papal ordinances were declared to be infringements of the laws of France; the Society was forbidden to admit novices, its penmen were condemned as corrupters of morals and guilty of high treason; their books were ordered to be burned. But Louis XV. protected the convicted Jesuits, accorded them a suspension of judgment for a year, procured a vote of the clergy which was favorable to the Society; and now at court the clergy labored on behalf of the Jesuits while the minister Choiseul and the king's mistress the Marchioness de Pompadour were in opposition. The king had no recourse save that of asking Ricci, General of the Jesuits, to modify the objectionable points in the Constitution of the order. He received the memorable answer, "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint" (they shall stand as they are or not at all). Thereupon Louis suffered matters to take their course. In 1762 seals were set on all archives and libraries of Jesuits in France, and an account taken of the posessions of all the colleges, whereupon the Jesuits, known to be enormously wealthly, declared themselves insolvent. The parlement then decreed the further existence of the society to be inconsistent with the well being of the realm, prohibited Jesuits from wearing the garb of their order, released them from the obligation of obedience to their General, and dissolved all their colleges and houses. The parlement instituted a suit against Beaumont archbishop of Paris for defending the Jesuits in a pastoral letter; at the same session the parlement ordered Rousseau's "Emile" to be burnt by the hangman. The archbishop had written a pastoral letter

against the same book. When the Pope also intervened on behalf of the Jesuits, the parlement, 1764, condemned and suppressed the papal briefs. And then the king sought to end the strife by his absurd decree: he quashed all the ordinances of the parlement touching the Society, but at the same time suppressed the Society in France.

Spain followed. Charles III. who in 1759 had exchanged the throne of Naples for that of his mother's country, was in his new position surrounded by men devoted to the cause of Illuminism and admirers of the French minister Choiseul. Grimaldi, Genoese, mere tool of Choiseul and believer in Diderot's principles, was minister of foreign affairs. His fellow ministers were the unprincipled Campomanes, man of letters, the cultured and patriotic Aranda, the learned Figueroa, skilled in civil and canon law, the egotistic Olavides, and the temporising Manino (afterward Count de Florida-Blanca). Charles III. who was a thorough "enlightened despot" (though not in matters of belief), readily suffered himself to be enlisted against the Jesuits as the most formidable rivals of every throne. Herein he was in accord with men of undoubted piety, e, g,. Palafox, archbishop of Mexico, who had unmasked the Jesuits of America, and nevertheless after his death had been proposed for beatification. Palafox's vicar general had, as early as 1747, at the instance of the people, refused to Jesuits unprovided with the proper faculties, permission to hear confessions and to preach; in return the pious fathers so persecuted the archbishop that he had to flee; afterward they hindered his beatification. Charles III. cancelled the decrees by which the Inquisition, at request of the Jesuits, had condemned to be burnt Palafox's letters against their brethren, and then ordered an investigation into the doings of the order in

America. Again, in 1766, because the minister of finance, Squillace, already hated as a foreigner and one of the partisans of Illuminism, had made a monopoly of the trade in oil and other necessaries of life, there was a popular outbreak in Madrid, during which the populace wrecked the minister's house, cheered for the Jesuits, and besieged the king in his palace till he was compelled to promise, much against his will, that he would dismiss the minister. Afterward the king in revenge for the violence that had been offered him had a prosecution entered by Aranda against the authors of the outbreak, who were found to be Jesuits. After due preparation all Jesuits in Spain, more than five thousand, were in one night arrested, their goods sequestered, and themselves put on board ships and deported to Rome: it was precisely as under Pombal, but the thing was done with greater dispatch and thoroughness. The Society was next suppressed in Spain by royal edict and its members declared felons, nevertheless a very scanty pension was granted to them. Clement XIII. would not even allow the fathers to land, wretchedly packed as they were on shipboard; so dumfounded was he at the fate of his proteges and at the scorn expressed in the "manifest" of the "cargo" shipped. But in Spain, Aranda, Campomanes, and their associates, despite the resistance of the king's confessors, proceeded with the work of reform. The supreme ecclesiastical court of appeal was made independent of the nuncio, and the monastic orders of their heads at Rome; the privileges of church asylum were restricted; the censorship also was regulated: and the royal placet was made essential for the publication of papal briefs. Instead of the regular clergy the secular clergy were charged with the work of instruction in the schools (a step of progress in that day!) and new seminaries took the place of those conducted by Jesuits. An agricultural

and industrial school was set up in the college of the Jesuits. For the first time a census of the population was instituted. But as the king grew older, more compliant with the suggestions of his father confessor, and more mistrustful regarding the tendency of Aranda's policy; and as moreover Aranda's friend Olavides, a native of Peru, in his capacity as intendant general of Andalusia was importing German and other colonists, without any selection and without regard to their fitness, some of them Protestants even, into the wastes of the Sierra Morena; the Inquisition took up this last point and, Aranda being fortunately absent as envoy at Paris, brought prosecution against Olavides, one of the colonists, a German Capuchin, filling the role of accuser. Olavides was thrown into prison as a heretic, 1776; the theatre which he had erected at Seville as a means of counteracting the bloody bull fights was closed; after a long interval autos de fe were held again; the anathemas against heretics were again publicly proclaimed, and every Spaniard of ten years or more obliged to be present on the occassion; finally Olavides after a confinement of two years, was made to recant publicly. He might easily have made his escape from his place of imprisonment in a monastery; but during the French revolution, out of alarm for that movement, he voluntarily returned to Catholic orthodoxy. Aranda, from his post at Paris, and Campomanes in his place as minister, labored yet a while as ever before; but under the next king, Charles IV., things took a retrograde turn, not without the cooperation of the new minister, Count de Florida-Blanca.

In those days what Spain did Naples must not leave undone. Having been ever since the 15th century a vassal state of the western peninsula, after the middle of the 18th century it was a secundo-

geniture of the same. When the first independent king of Naples Charles IV. succeeded to the Spanish crown (as Charles III.) in 1759, he left there his trusty minister Tanucci as regent for his still minor son Ferdinand, who showed no fitness for any station save that of a sturdy lazzarone. The kingdom, which embraced south Italy, had then 22 archbishops, 116 bishops, 56,500 priests, 31,800 monks and friars, a total of 112,000 spiritual persons, together with 23,000 nuns; in the city of Naples alone were 16,000 spiritual persons. These were all independent of secular jurisdiction, as also were all persons taking refuge in places enjoying rights of asylum. Even while Charles was king of Naples, a concordat had been negociated with Rome designed to remedy these evils; but as the terms seemed disadvantageous to the government, steps were taken to make them more favorable. Hence, to reduce the number of churchly parasites, it was proposed that for each thousand souls not more than one priest should be ordained; that papal bulls should not be published without the royal placet; that the spirituality (clergy and religious orders) should not inherit any new properties; and that episcopal anathema should be of no effect against royal ordinances. After the change in the government Tanucci continued to act in the same spirit. He suppressed ten convents on the continent and twenty-eight in Sicily, and confiscated their property in the interest of the state: he first reduced the church tithes, and then did them away; forbade to the clergy the acquisition of real estate; restricted ecclesiastical jurisdiction: cut down the number of clerics permitted (one to each 1000) by one half; and abrogated the authority of ancient bulls that had not been approved by the state. Finally, in the selfsame year that the Jesuits were expelled from Spain, (1767) the like was

also done in Naples. They were driven from all parts of the kingdom to the Roman frontier; nor was there in this case sent any "manifest" to the Pope, nor was any apology deemed requisite.

The fourth Bourbon state of Europe (or the Spanish tertio-geniture* in Italy), the duchy of Parma, did not tarry long in the rear. The duke, a minor, who began his reign 1756, was a ward of Louis XV., his maternal grandfather. In this duchy the regent, Du Tillot, abrogated the privilege of appeal to Rome from the judgments of ecclesiastical courts, and annulled the force of papal bulls 1768. Thereupon the Pope did what he had not dared to do in the case of more powerful states—issued an emphatic brief against Parma, cited the bull "In Coena Domini," first published in the 14th century by Urban V., and extended by Pius V., 1567, and by Urban VIII., 1627. This bull is directed against all heretics and schismatics and their protectors; it declares that "the spiritual order should not obey the secular power where the rights of the Church are concerned." The Pope furthermore excommunicated the duke and threatened the duchy with interdict and the duke and his minister with anathema unless the ordinance was repealed. Du Tillot replied in a scornful proclamation and with arrest of the Jesuits, who were packed off to Rome. But the Bourbon governments sided with Parma against the bull; their envoys demanded of the Pope withdrawal of the brief of excommunication; and their ministers took new measures against the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in their respective states; the royal tribunal of Naples even, because of the Pope's attack on the secular jurisdiction, ordained the seizure of the pontifical enclaves, Benevento and Pontecorvo. Tanucci put forth the declaration that

* A third son's portion.

the Pope is no more than another bishop; and the parlement of Paris ordered the suppression of the brief against Parma. Other governments joined in the movement. The Grand Master of Malta also expelled the Jesuits, Venice condemned the bull "In Coena," and Modena suppressed the religious houses.

Austria and Catholic Germany were now astir. Joseph II., co-regent with his mother, and the powerful minister Kaunitz, were likewise opponents of the Jesuits and of their protector Clement XIII., and like views were held by Van Swieten, counsellor of the Empress. Maria Theresa was induced to confer upon a special commission all the rights till then exercised in Lombardy by the Pope and the bishops over the person and property of ecclesiastics, to require the clergy to sell all property acquired by them since 1722, and to do away with the appeal to Rome. About the same time arose in Germany a professor of canon law who reduced to system the essential principles of all the legislation of the Bourbon states and Portugal against the church hierarchy. This was John Nicolas von Hontheim, coadjutor bishop of Treves, just coeval with the century, who in 1765, under the pseudonym "Justinus Febronius" published the work "De Statu Praesenti Ecclesiae et de Legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis." The secular authorities and their numerous adherents, i. e., at that time all educated persons of the laity and very many of the clergy, hailed with exultation the "gospel of liberal Catholicism;" in Portugal a special edition of it was published; the Spanish writer Campomanes quoted it in all his tractates of the canon law; as for Joseph II., he so took the volume for his chart and compass that the system therein defended has ever since gone preferably by the name of "Josephinism." But Hontheim, whose authorship was no secret, was

harried by the obscurantists and by his superiors, at the special instigation of the Jesuit father confessor of the archbishop of Treves, ever till he made a declaration that looked like a retractation, though in a printed document issued at the same date, in which he defended his original views, he maintained the correctness of that formula * Hontheim died 1790.

Meanwhile in Germany also the dissatisfaction of enlightened Catholics with the Roman system, especially with the Jesuits, was rising. Even in the then bigoted electorate of Bavaria this spirit was making headway. Under the elector Maximilian Joseph the Tyrolese Ferdinand Sterzinger, like Thomasius, was laboring for the abolition of trials for witchcraft. Even so late as 1750 two girls of 13 years fell victims of such prosecutions, which were approved by the Jesuits. The Elector protected Sterzinger when attacked by the pious fathers; about 1769 he established in Munich the ecclesiastical commission under the direction of his privy counsellor Peter von Osterwald, for the purpose of compelling the clergy, regular and secular, to pay taxes to the state and of limiting the admission of novices. Osterwald too, like Houtheim, wrote, but in German, against the laziness and avarice of the clergy: his book was censured by the clergy but approved by the elector. The Placet was also introduced, and the Jesuits were declared—the same action being taken simultaneously

*That is, held the form of his so-called "retractation" to be consistent with the doctrine of his work "De Statu Præsenti," etc. The second work of Hontheim referred to in the text was published at Vienna 1771 and was entitled "Febronius Abbreviatus et Emendatus." This he followed, 1781, with a third tractate, "Febronii Commentarius," in which he still defended his original opinions It is a curious circumstance that Houtheim's main work was formally dedicated to the Pope, Clement XIII. Translator.

in the episcopal electorate of Mayence—enemies of the state, for that they revamped Bellarmin's seditious writings for their own ends.

While affairs were in this situation the Jesuitophil Pope Clement XIII. died 1769, and was succeeded by Clement XIV., Lawrence Ganganelli, his opposite pole. The election of Ganganelli was the work of Joseph II. in conjunction with the anti-Jesuit governments of southern Europe: the Emperor had corresponded personally with Choiseul, Aranda, and Pombal; and Maria Theresa, though loth, had to give approval. The intrigues of Migazzi, Archbishop of Vienna, were thwarted, and the casuists of the Society of Jesus were inhibited in Austria. It was high time to come to the rescue of the Catholic Church. Her very existence was threatened; for had the new Pope not moved against the Jesuits, the governments that had already expelled them would beyond doubt sooner or later have cut their dominions loose from the Catholic hierarchy. Hence Ganganelli at his election had been obliged to promise that he would take the step indicated; but began his official career with other reforms, e. g., doing away with the reading of the bull "In Coena," and revoking the brief against Parma, whereby he hoped to quiet that government and to spare himself the necessity of taking the step for which he feared the vengeance of the Jesuits. But in vain: France proclaimed her purpose to hold Avignon and the Venaissin, and Naples to hold Benevento and Pontecorvo till their demands were satisfied. Ganganelli must needs comply. He closed the Roman Seminary 1772, then the other colleges in the papal dominion; finally, July 23, he published the world-famous brief (to take effect August 19, 1773) "Dominus ac Redemptor Noster," whereby the Society was suppressed. The world credit-

ed whether to the prudence or to the craft of the Pope the fact that the weightiest charges against the Jesuits were passed over. These were, the despotic system and mechanical, superficial method of their school instruction; the dominion acquired by the Society through affiliated lay members in all countries, places, and classes; the espionage through the confessional, and the misuse of that institution (the confessional), of which the fathers were notoriously guilty; the wrong principles of morality taught in their writings; their state within state, so richly endowed, so blindly obedient, and therefore so dangerous to the political regime. But his cautious policy availed Ganganelli nothing: he died one year after the act of suppression—doubtless the boldest act ever done by any Pope.

At the suppression the Jesuits had 24 houses of the professed, 669 colleges, 176 ecclesiastical seminaries, 61 novitiates, 335 residences, 273 missions, and 22,600 members, half of them priests—not counting "Jesuits of the short robe."

The suppression of the order however proved of no effect; for its spirit, obscurantism (fitly called also Jesuitism), still endured. Even the personnel of the order held its ground as such in countries subject to paleocatholic governments, as in Greco-Orthodox Russia, where Catherine saw nothing repulsive in the frivolity of the order; and in Protestant Prussia, where Frederic would not have it said of him that the victor of Rossbach had any fear of men exiled by his vanquished enemies. Even where the order had been suppressed, not only was the absence of the Society of no advantage to the cause of progress: there was even a a general, almost an epidemic inclination toward retrogression. The well nigh unlimited dominion exercised down to the middle of the century over the educated

classes in Europe by the ideas of Illuminism was by degrees checked, particularly in the seventh decade, by a serious reaction, though the utterances of the spirit of progress had declined neither in force nor in reach. The reaction was seen in the reappearance of the Kabbala, in the doctrines of Lavater and the allied doctrines of Hamann and Jacobi; in the juggleries, exorcisms, and spiritisms of Mesmer, Gessner, Saint-Germain and Cagliostro, of Swedenborg and Jung-Stilling, and of their counterpart in France, the enthusiast-seer Saint-Martin; finally, in the Jesuitic perversion of freemasonry by the Rosicrucians. At the same time opportunely came the fall of Pombal in Portugal, of Aranda in Spain, beside the suppression of the Illuminati in Bavaria and of the freemasons in Austria; for the ex-Jesuits were slinking about and restlessly contriving how they might regain their lost power, and so became more dangerous than confessed Jesuits had ever been. Already in 1780 the Jesuits had control of the catechisms and schoolbooks; they were for shutting out even the faintest glimmer of light; for example, they would not suffer one to say "I believe on God," but only "in God." Nay, "judgments' did service in giving instruction on Christian faith and morals.

All the arrangements that had been broken up by the French Revolution and its sequels having been now substantially restored, Pope Pius VII in 1814 restored also the corporate existence of the Society of the Jesuits and all its rights. Since then the order has grown somewhat, but very slowly, and it has never attained anything like the strength it had at the suppression. Its members in 1844 numbered 4,133, in 1857 6,303, in 1860 7,144 (among them 2,939 priests), in 1865 7,956, (priests 3,389), and in 1872 (before its expulsion from Germany) 8,809. Thus in not quite 30

years the numerical strength of the society was more than doubled: a notable fact. Nor is its influence by any means inconsiderable. To the Jesuits is to be credited the founding of the "Catholic universities," namely institutions of advanced instruction in which the teaching is only such as the Pope and the Jesuits allow —a phenomenon that were laughable but for the shame and scandal that such things can be. To institutions of this kind belongs the University of Louvain in Belgium; and the scheme has got footing in France where there are several such establishments: but, because of altered tendencies in political affairs, the institutions seem not to prosper as well as the party could wish. There is already a "Catholic University" in Switzerland, at Freiburg; but it has not yet a medical faculty. In Germany and Austria the Ultramontanes are hoping for clerical schools to be established at Fulda and Salzburg. Even in the United States one of these institutions has been set up, and that in the national capital, Washington.

That the whole system of damning as heretical all free thought, nay thought itself, and superseding it with a mechanical soulless faith, is steadily gaining strength in the Catholic church and alienating from her all candid thinkers; and that this system is none other than that of the Jesuit Society, is apparent from its general characterization; for it reduces the Catholic, as the Jesuit rule requires, to the condition of a corpse in the hands of the ghostly shepherd. And this appears more plainly when we attend to the fact that the moral system of the Jesuits is compiled and condensed in recent text books and set forth in all its immoral nudity with the imprimatur of the highest church authorities. These textbooks, one of them written by the Jesuit father Gury, another by the American Archbish-

op Kenrick, have as a matter of fact* been introduced into Catholic theological seminaries; and the confessors that are to be, are by such authors led to acquaint themselves with all the foulness of immoral conduct down to the minutest hair splitting details.

As the Jesuit moral doctrine or rather Jesuit casuistry betrays itself in these writings, so is the scholastic logic or rather dialectic of the Society plainly revealed in recent acts of the Holy See dictated by the Jesuits. Pius IX. was a good man and of the best intentions as far as his point of view allowed: but it was his foible that he must use every opportunity for asserting his power and dignity. This the Jesuits had long known, and hence, while humoring his fancies and letting him think that he was carrying out his own purposes, they induced him to adopt measures which their system held to be of service in assuring to the Society absolute control of the Church and thereby of the largest aggregations of humanity in Christendom. Such Jesuit-inspired papal acts are, 1, the dogmatic definition of the immaculate conception of Mary; 2, the encyclical "condemning the principal errors of the time," with the "Syllabus" annexed; 3, the decree of the Vatican Council regarding papal infalibility.

That the decree of infallibility should have been coincident in time with the declaration of war by France against Germany, we hold to have been no accident. True, the decree of the Council got its answer in the overthrow of the papal State, and the declaration of war in the ruin of the French empire and the humiliation of the aggressor. But that the Ultramontanes everywhere sympathize with France, and that everywhere

* "As a matter of fact" Kenrick's "Theologia Moralis," never has obtained a place in theolgical schools as an ordinary text book. It is used for reference. Translator.

they are hostile to Germany is known. Nor is it an accidental coincidence that, while France is courting an alliance with Russia against Germany, renouncing in Russia's favor her earlier sympathies with Poland, the Austrian Ultramontanes unite with the Slavs whose race idea is separation from Austria and union with Russia; while the Croat bishop Strossmayr, formerly the opponent of papal infallibility, writes to the Russian Church a letter of congratulation, not receives from the Pope any sort of reprimand. Significant also is the fact that in 1872 the Ultramontanes and the Italian Swiss were a unit in rejecting the draft of a liberal federal constitution for their country, while to-day the Ultramontanes coalesce in many points with the Social Democrats, with whose assistance they hope to abolish the creedless state, or rather the state independent of creeds. In entire consistency with this, the Social-Democrats of Germany have aided to bring forward in the Reichstag the notorious and, as we hope, the effectless resolution in favor of the Jesuits.

CHAPTER IV.

CONSTITUTION OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.

By "constitution" we mean here the process by which a man becomes a Jesuit, and the rules which govern the Jesuit in his work. The former point is settled in the "Exercitia Spiritualia," the work written by the

enthusiastic founder of the order, and which is based on his own experiences. The other point is contained in the "Constitutions" of the order, the rough draft of which by Ignatius was worked over by his successor, the politic James Laynez. The "Exercitia" is the spiritual life of the Jesuit Society, the "Constitutiones" its body.

The aim of the Society is defined to be "not only, with the help of God's grace, to labor for the salvation and the perfecting of those who constitute the Society, but also, with that same help, and with all one's strength to labor for the salvation and perfecting of the neighbor". To gain these ends, the members take the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. The vow of poverty is to be understood in the sense that the individual members as well as the churches and houses shall have no incomes, but shall be supported by alms.

The members are enrolled in four classes which, rising from lower to higher, are as follows:

I. NOVICES, who, as a rule, pass two years in a novitiate house under close observation; of their eventual place in the order the novices learn nothing. They are subjected to severe tests to decide whether there be any inpediment to their reception, such impediments being deviation from the faith, crime or grievous sins, attachment to another religious order, wedlock, serious bodily blemishes. Investigation is made of all their personal family, and other relations; their natural dispositions and aptitudes, their opinions and aims. They must undergo five capital tests, giving to each one month's time, viz., performing the spiritual exercises; serving in hospitals; journeying moneyless and begging; rendering lowly and despised service; instructing children or uneducated persons in the catechism, or in the articles of christian belief. They may associate only with

such of their comrades as the superiors may determine; of their parents they are to speak only as though they were dead; and they are counselled to sever every tie that binds them to their family. A general confession ends the career of the novice, whose occupation from hour to hour during the day is carefully prescribed for him.

II. SCHOLASTICS take the three vows, bind themselves to enter the order; if required, study the sciences according to the system of the Jesuits; and again go through the "exercises", and another period of test.

III. COADJUTORS are still free to be either clerics or seculars. In the latter case they serve the order as cooks, gardeners, hospital attendents, and servants of whatever sort; the clerics devote themselves mainly to the instruction of youth.

VI. PROFESSED must, as coadjutors, have received priest's orders; they take a fourth vow, viz. to be unconditionally at the call of the Pope, to obey his order sending them anywhere whithersoever he may please. (They are called "professed" because they have taken (professi sunt) the fourth vow). The Professed are the rulers of the order and devote themselves entirely to its aims. They number only about two per centum of the membership.

Besides these four classes there are also affiliated Jesuits, that is persons who without taking the monastic vows, labor for the good of the order and obey the order unconditionally. These are called "Jesuits of the short robe." Their organization and their relation to the order and the outside world, as also their personality, are secrets. So, too, there are Jesuitesses.

The supreme dignitary of the Society is the Father-General who possesses absolute power; who names all officials of the order, and can depose them: he is elected

for life. For his cabinet ministers he has Assistants (assistentes), four to six in number, each of whom has supervision of a determinate portion of the globe (the assignment being often altered). Each Assistant has charge of a certain number of the "Provinces" into which the globe is divided: at the head of each province is a Provincial. There are to-day in Austria and Germany with the Netherlands three provinces, in Italy four, in France two. The total number of provinces is seventeen. The heads of local communities are Superiors. These communities are either houses of professed, and of these there are three, in Rome, Palermo, and Genoa, respectively; retreats (or houses for the exercitia) two, one in Rome the other in Lyons; then, a number of novitiates, seminaries, colleges, boarding schools, and missions. Attached to each dignitary—the General, the Assistants, Provincials, Superiors, is an Admonitor or a Consultor to remind him of his duties. For superintendence of the provincial administration Visitors are appointed by the General. Procurators attend to the accounts and the law affairs of the order and Revisors to the censorship of the writings of members. The general assembly, which consists of the Assistants and of delegates, under the presidency of the general, chooses the General and Assistants, in case of necessity decides on their deposition, and confirms changes of the Constitutions made by the General, and all alienations of the order's property. In very grave emergencies a general congregation is called in which all the professed may take part. Each province has furthermore a provincial congregation.

Whatever order is given by Superiors in the Society of Jesus to their subjects must be executed without question by them "as though they were a corpse" (per-

inde ac si cadaver essent); and they must submit to be treated by Superiors "like the staff in the hand of an aged man," to use the words of the "Constitutions" (Part vi., chap. 1). And in the same code (vi., 5) occurs a sentence that has been variously translated, and which therefore we give in the original. "Visum est nobis in domino . . . . . nullas constitutiones, declarationes, vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum mortale vel veniale inducere, nisi superior ea in nomine domini Jesu Christi vel in virtute obedientiæ jubeat." * On this Ranke "History of the Popes," vol. I, p. 223 of the 4th edition) remarks: "From this it would appear that the Superior's power to give a command involving a sinful act, is one of very exceptional character indeed."

As this relation (of inferiors to superiors) involves blind obedience, so too the mutual relations of equals as well as those of superiors to inferiors involve mistrust. All letters written or received by Jesuits must be read

---

* Whatever may have been the mind of the writer of the sentence, or whatever the meaning that an apologist may give it, a fair translation, without shadow of bias, would be: "It hath seemed to us in the Lord . . . that no constitutions, declarations, or order of life [no monastic rule, for example] can impose obligation to a sin, mortal or venial, unless a superior commands them in the name of Lord Jesus Christ or in virtue of obedience." But what is the meaning of the phrase obligat on to a sin, mortal or venial? Does it mean, as Ranke appears to think, and obligation to commit a sin or, obligation to observe the constitutions etc., so binding that to violate them is a sin? It must be admitted that the grammatical construction of the sentence requires us to refer "them" (ea) to constitutions, declarations, and order of life, and not to "sin" (peccatum). The sentence would therefore seem to be innocent enough, viz., that a Jesuit violating the rules of the Society commits no sin unless a superior commands their observance "in the name of Lord Jesus Christ," etc.—Translator.

by Superiors. The Jesuit Mariana writes of this: "The entire rule of the Society rests on delationes (the stories of informers), which like a virus permeate the whole body so that no brother may trust another. With boundless love of dominion our General takes up all the reports of informers in his archives, and puts faith in them without ever giving a hearing to the one against whom they are directed." (Mariana, "De Morbis Societatis Jesu," Cap ii., Aph. 24). Every man in authority reports to his superiors at stated times upon his subjects; each officer's Admonitor or Consultor reports upon him to the General; on certain occasions also the Superiors report direct to the General, without intermediation of the Provincials; finally the Assistentes watch the General himself, and must proceed against him when he is delinquent. Precise lists of all members and their doings are kept at headquarters.

From the foregoing it is sufficiently evident that among the Jesuits, of all their vows greatest stress is laid on obedience. By this obedience every independent thought is strangled, nay all individual development of character is made impossible, so that the Society in fact has produced no men of high original genius. The vow of chastity is mentioned in few words ("Constitutions," vi., 1.); and the poverty enjoined on the members ("Const." ix., 3, 6, 7) is subject to so many exceptions, that this vow is really non-existent in the Society. Even the member who is expelled does not get back the offerings made by him to the Society. According the declarations of Father-General Laynez, whenever the ends of the Society require it the Jesuit may spend considerable sums of money, live in ease and comfort, and wear costly attire (all "for the greater glory of God," adds this disciple of Loyola).

Regarding the "Spiritual Exercises" of Loyola,

to which every Jesuit yearly as long as he lives must devote eight days at the least, and the novice thirty days, we will quote the just remarks of a recent historian: "The whole book is a psychological masterpiece. With the skill of a virtuoso he controls the whole heart of man, its most recondite motives, its finest and its basest sentiments. The loftiest thoughts and the sensual instincts of man are made to serve the purposes of the writer, which contemplate the total subjection of the soul to God, i. e., to the Catholic Church. No means is overlooked, least of all external means, such as keeping an exact account, in writing, of our sins; repeated confessions; exciting the imagination to the point of hallucination; regular dialogues between the penitent and his own soul, his conscience, Jesus Christ, the Virgin, the saints; urging the penitent to acquire a sense of moral pain and a feeling of self-abasement, and the gift of tears; suggesting fervid prayers, always fitted to the case in hand; presenting before the mind the image of the crucified Jesus; portraying hell with all its tortures." (Philippson, "Westeuropa," Introd., p. 56). The novice is awakened at midnight: skeletons are displayed before his eyes when he is to be attuned in melancholy mood; flowers greet his senses when the purpose is to strike the lighter chords. Certain postures and movements are prescribed to him; fasting and use of the discipline are not omitted. But the aim of it all is complete subjection of the will and of the whole being to the Roman Church. The fathers of the church, Thomas of Aquino, and the pet theologians of the Jesuits must in the mind of the one who goes through the spiritual exercises be of equal authority with the Bible. What the Church calls black, says Ignatius, the disciple must recognize as black though it appear to him white. The Jesuit Bellarmin goes farther still and says that even sin, when order-

ed by the Pope, becomes a duty; or to cite his own words, "Were the Pope to err and to recommend vice and to condemn virtue, the Church is bound to believe that the vices are good and the virtues are evil, if she would not sin against her conscience: she must believe what he commands to be good, and what he forbids evil." ("De Controversiis," T. I., de Romano Pontifice, lib. IV., c. 5). The count Paul von Hoensbroech, who quit the Society of Jesus 1893 bears this testimony: "Jesuitism levels down the spiritual independence of its members; it forces individualities into one all-receiving, all subduing mould, thus deforming them and preventing their coming to their natural development . . . . What the novice is to do from one quarter of an hour to another is prescribed by authority . . . If a novice wants a draught of water, a piece of paper, a book, a pencil, he must ask leave . . . Each novice has assigned to him a guardian angel, so called, that is to say: two novices are required daily at a fixed hour to observe each other and note the faults they may commit. Several times a year comes what is called the 'stoning': each novice in turn must kneel, and then each of the rest may fault his outward defects, for instance his too rapid gait, or too slow, his speaking too loud or too low, etc. . . . Every week certain of his comrades are named, with whom alone he is to converse. In brief, it is the whole man, in all his movements and all his behavior by day and by night that is taken in hand and moulded."

CHAPTER V.

MORAL DOCTRINES OF THE JESUITS.

THE moral principles of the Jesuits are usually expressed in the proposition, The end justifies the means. It has not indeed been proven that this proposition occurs in the same order of words in any work written by a Jesuit: but its Jesuit descent appears as well from the fact that, as regards its sense, it follows, as we shall clearly see, from the opinions of moralists who were members of the Society; as also from the following propositions of Jesuit theologians. Herman Busembaum, in his "Medulla Theologiae Moralis" (first published at Frankfort on the Main 1650) gives this as a theorem (p. 320): Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita (when the end is lawful the means also are lawful); and p. 504: Cui licitus est finis, etiam licent media (For whom the end is lawful the means are lawful also). The Jesuit Paul Layman, in his "Theologia Moralis," lib. III., p. 20 (Munich, 1625), quoting Sanchez, states the proposition in these words: Cui concessus est finis, concessa etiam sunt media ad finem ordinata (to whom the end is permitted, to him also are permitted the means ordered to the end). Escobar, in his "Universæ Theologiæ Moralis Receptæ Sententiæ," t. IV., p. 336 (Lyons 1652–3) has this: Non peccat qui ob bonum finem in actibus ex natura

sua malis delectatur (he sins not who for a good end takes pleasure in acts of their own nature evil); finis enim (he explains) dat specificationem actibus, et ex bono vel malo fine boni vel mali redduntur (for the end gives specific character to acts, and they are rendered good or evil through a good or evil end). The same proposition is also found in the writings of Sotus, Toletanus, Navarra, Vasquez, Sanchez, Lessius, Sayre, Sylvester, and others. In Charles Anthony Casnedi's "Crisis Theologica," t. I. p. 119 we read: Nunquam posse peccari sine advertentia ad malitian, nunquam cum bona intentione (never can sin be committed without advertence to the wickedness [of the act], never with a good intention [i. e. never when the intention is good]. And the same, in t. 2, p. 381 writes: Bonum morale non pendet nisi a judicio operantis, quod, sive sit sive non sit materialiter conforme legi dei, dummodo ut est sub judicio prudenti, sit formaliter conforme legi dei, ut ab operante apprehensæ, satis est deo, qui primario operantis intentionem considerat (the moral goodness [of an act] depends solely on the judgment of the doer, which [the judgment] whether it be or be not materially conformable to God's law, provided only it be, as it is in the case of a prudent judgment, formally accordant to God's law as understood by the doer, is enough in the sight of God, who considers chiefly the intention of the doer). James Illsung says in his "Arbor Sapientiæ" etc., p., 153: Cui licitus est finis, illi licet etiam medium ex natura sua ordinatum ad talem finem (to whom the end is lawful, to him are also lawful the means naturally ordained to such end). Louis Wagemann, Jesuit professor of moral theology, in his "Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis" (Innsbruck and Augsburg 1762) has: Finis determinat moralitatem actus (the end decides the morality of the act). Edmund Voit, in his

"Theologia Moralis," part I. p. 123 (Wurzburg 1790, new edition 1860) teaches that Cui finis licet, ei et media permissa sunt: and p. 472 he says, Cui concessus est finis, concessa etiam sunt media ad finem ordinata. Father Vincent Filliucius (Figliuzzi;) of Siena, in his "Quaestiones Morales de Christianis Officiis in Casibus Conscientiae" t. II. p. 161 (Lyons 1634), teaches that Intentio discernit actionem (the intention gives character to the act). And in recent times John Peter Gury, in his "Casus Conscientiæ," p. 332 (Regensburg 1865) states the proposition in this form: Ubi licitus est finis, etiam licita sunt media per se indifferentia (means in themselves indifferent). Finally, the most recent of all Jesuit moral theologians, Augustin Lehmkuhl, in "Theologia Moralis" I. p. 32 5th ed; Friburg, 1888) says: Moralitas desumitur ex fine (the morality is deduced from the end).

But inasmuch as to the foregoing phrases are attached numerous exceptions and reserves; and as in many cases "bad means"—a rather elastic expression surely —are excluded, therefore the oft cited proposition cannot pass for one expressly and in that very form taught by the Jesuits. On the other hand the passages quoted give indisputable proof that the proposition "The end justifies the means" has been not without reason credited to the Jesuits.

It is too true that even outside of the Society of of Jesus, and even among its stanchest opponents, the rule that the end justifies the means is widely adopted. But that is inevitabie, for the adoption of that maxim cannot be brought within the limits of a paragraph in a criminal code. Yet the maxim that when the end is lawful the means are lawful also, would be of little importance if it stood alone and were not linked to practical consequences. But the mischief is that the

whole moral teaching of the Jesuits from their early days till now is but a further extension of this proposition, so redoubtable in its application. And this moral teaching is all the more dangerous because in many instances it stands in flat contradiction to the life of its first propounders and therefore the more likely indirectly to encourage men in ill doing or at least to excuse them. For among these moralists one of the most eminent is Antony de Escobar (born 1589, died 1669,) who led a life of the most austere morality, and who devoted himself to his clerical duties with the most exact fidelity: and the same can be said of most, if not all of the other Jesuit moralists. Nevertheless these men, by the lax morality of their teaching, have indirectly given a sanction to whoever regards their own austere lives as unnecessary for the attainment of religious and moral good.

No artificial coloring can hide the fact that nearly all the Jesuits who have written on morality, and among them fifty or sixty diligent authors and gifted scholars of distinction, have taught regarding acts which the sound human understanding and the moral precepts of all civilized peoples pronounce evil, in some cases that such acts are permissible, in other cases that their goodness or badness is an open question. And now as no Jesuit teacher of morality is known whose principles accord entirely with the universally accepted morality; and as the writings in which the opposite stand is taken have been expressly approved by the Society, therefore the historian is fully justified in regarding the doctrine of noted Jesuit moralists as the doctrine of the Society itself. It is, however, our duty to say that as compared with the older Jesuit moralists (of the 16th to the 18th century) the more recent writer Gury (1870) strikes a much more severe moral chord, and that the still more

recent Lehmkuhl, as compared with Gury, makes a further advance in the direction of the generally recognized code of morals. If the Jesuits are in earnest in the matter, we have reason to be glad; yet in view of their past they must not blame us for a certain mistrust of their sincerity.

The theories of the Jesuits in their so-called moral theology may all be reduced to sundry artifices whereby they get a moral code of greatest possible laxity and least possible stringency; so that the French wit Hallier once said of the Jesuit Bauny, Lo, there is he who taketh away the sins of the world. These artifices are; Probabilism, the Method of Directing the Intention, and Mental Reservation; and to these principal instruments are added certain subordinate ones, as Equivocation, Utilism, Clandestinism, Quietism, and Formalism.

"Probabilism," the ground principle of all Jesuit moral doctrine, teaches that any act is lawful which is pronounced lawful by any respectable authority (doctor gravis); and of course in the eyes of a Jesuit "a respectable authority" means Jesuit authority. This is the teaching of the Jesuit moralists Sanchez, Navarra, Escobar, Sa, and others; these distinctly hold that the opinion of one learned man (that is, of one respectable authority on morals), though a hundred other learned men differ with him, is a "probable" opinion and may be acted on without hesitation. Now suppose that several "learned men" (doctores graves) hold, some of them that a given act is lawful, the rest that it is not lawful: in that case one is free to do the act or not. Emanuel Sa goes still farther and says that "a person may do an act which he holds on a probable opinion to be lawful, though the opposite opinion be safer in conscience." And Escobar teaches that one may act on a less probable opinion, rejecting the more probable;

and even that one may give up the safer opinion and adopt another if that other is but equally probable. Among several more or less "probable" courses of action the Jesuit will naturally take for himself, and on occasion counsel others to take, that one which may seem the most advantageous to his Society (magis conveniens Nostris, as the phrase runs in the "Declar. in Const.") whether that same be good or bad.

This theory seems most dangerous as applied in the confessional, one of the most important branches of the Society's work. The Jesuits Escobar and Vasquez teach that the father confessor may according to circumstances recommend to a penitent a less probable course of action (i. e. one backed by a less probable opinion), and even one that is opposed to his own(the confessor's) view, if the course recommended be easier and more advantageous; and the Jesuit Bauny carries this principle farther, saying that if the opinion upon which a person has acted is probable, the father confessor **must** give absolution though his own opinion be totally different; and if he withholds absolution he commits mortal sin. Sanchez and Suarez teach the same doctrine.

Lehmkuhl thus states his view of probabilism: "In all doubtful matters and wherever dispute exists whether a thing is lawful or no, one may adopt a really probable opinion which declares lawful the doing or the not doing, and this even though the contrary opinion declaring it to be unlawful be equally probable or even more probable." ("Theologia Moralis," I, 65). Plainly any course of action may be justified according to this doctrine.

What has just been said gains strong confirmation from the fact that one set of Jesuit moralists hold to be lawful the self same act which another set condemn.

While Vasquez distinctly condemns homicide, Lessius and Escobar exculpate homicide for revenge. Gregory de Valencia taught that the judge who finds as good probability of right on the side of one litigant as on that of the other, may decide in favor of the one whose counsel is the judge's friend; nay that, to oblige his friend, the judge may decide in one way now, anon in another—if no scandal ensue! Azor and Escobar ("Theol. moral." I, 48) allow a physician to prescribe a remedy the effect of which, it is hoped, may be beneficial, though it be more likely to do harm.

An equally handy instrument is the "directing the intention," which means that an act that on ordinary rules is sinful becomes lawful by the injection of some element of good. Thus, for example, the Jesuits Vasquez, Hurtado, and Tanner agree in teaching that a son may wish the death of his father and even may rejoice over it, provided he does not regard the father's death as an end, but has in mind only the heritable or inherited estate. And not content even with this, Father Fagundez gives allowance of the son's satisfaction, if while drunk he kills his father.

But specially important as regards the views of the earlier Jesuits is the doctrine of "mental reservation," with which in most cases the doctrine of equivocation is associated. There is mental reservation when a person affirms as true what is false, and even confirms his statement with an oath, at the same time adding to the spoken affirmation, in his mind, words by which the affirmation, is made true. "Equivocation," instead of keeping a part of the affirmation a mental secret, chooses a form of speech to which a different meaning may attach. Sanchez in particular is a strong defender of mental reservation and equivocation. He goes so far as to allow that a murderer on being questioned whether

he committed the crime, may answer no, meaning, for example, that he did not kill the man before he was born ("Opus Morale," I. iii p. 556). Cardenas too allows such equivocations as this: Suppose a man has murdered a Frenchman (in latin Gallus; but the same word means cock). The culprit can without lying say that he has killed no Gallus, ("Crisis Theologica" p. 395). Escobar stretches the doctrine so as to free a person from obligation to keep promises that he intended not to keep when he made them.

Still more dangerous may be the consequences of "Utilism," which permits one to commit a crime by means of which he can ward off from himself serious injury. For example, Lamy, Lessius, Tanner, and Navarra permit one by assassination, to anticipte a calumny, to escape a duel (and duels they hold to be lawful) by assassination of the adversary, nay to evade a degrading judgment by removing the judge and witnesses. According to Caramuel a man may kill the woman with whom he has had intimate relations if there is reason to fear that she will betray the secret.

Less harmful but equally despicable seem the doctrines of "Quietism," which permits sin as long as the soul gives itself up to the same "with reluctance," or when the person with whom the sin is committed consents thereto; of "Clandestinism," which (especially as represented by Escobar) excuses whatever remains secret (according to the maxim, Si non caste tamen caute· if not chaste, then 'cute); and of "Formalism," that wretched system which permits you to circumvent all the commandments if you transgress them under a form different from that expressed in the letter of the law: for example, one may read a forbidden book in the shape of detached leaves, for then he reads no

"book" at all.

If now we turn to the opinions of Jesuits as to individual crimes and offenses, we can dismiss in very few words the whole group of sins against sexual morality, because the Jesuit moralists have treated the subject in a way so offensive to the simplest feelings of decency that their teachings cannot be canvassed here. It is a significant fact that in the translations of father Gury's "Moral Theology" the chapter devoted to this subject is left in the original Latin and not done into the several modern languages. What most offends the reader is that the Jesuit moralists treat the female sex with abhorrence and disdain, and seem to attach the idea of sinfulness only to the leading astray of men by women, and not to the opposite fact though there nearly all the guilt lies. Man's misdeeds in this regard find plenty of excuses, so that there is hardly a case in which they are condemned; but poor woman fares much worse. Many Jesuits even allow the seducer to refuse to marry his victim if an untoward outcome of wedlock is "apprehended;" and they release the man from all obligation of amends to his partner in guilt, nay even from that of entreating the parents for pardon. The Jesuits also permit prostitution, which reduces women to slavery. (Gury, "Compendium," P. I, no. 431, nota 1). Filliucius and Tamburini even permit prostitution to "respectable" women and girls. We quote the shocking passage to this effect: had we not consulted the original of Tamburini we could hardly have believed such doctrine was to be found in it: the passage occurs in the "Explicatio Decalogi" lib. vii. cap. 5 § 3: At vero femina honesta potest petere et sumere quantum ei placet; ratio est quia in his et similibus rebus, quae pretio statuto vel vulgato carent, tanti res potest vendi quanti eam aestimat qui vendit. At puella honesta plurimi

potest suam honestatem aestimare; unde vides meretricem de qua numero praecedente fuit locutio, potuisse initio suae prostitutionis plus accipere; at ubi tanto vel tanto pretio honestatem suam aestimavit, huic ætimationi debet stare: secus venderet supra aestimationem*

* Dr. Am Rhyn does not translate the passage, lest he might offend against public decency. But as he quotes it expressly to show that Jesuits permit prostitution of "respectable" women and girls, justice requires that the jury (the public) should be put in possession of the testimony, though their "sense of propriety" be shocked. Especially should the testimony be put in intelligable form before the jury, if it can be shown that it does not teach the abominable doctrine of the permissibility of prostitution. A translation therefore is here given, but out of the same tender regard for the public sense of propriety "femina honesta" (reputable or respectable woman) will appear as "man of good reputation;" "puella honesta," the same; "meretrix," man of notoriously bad reputation; "prostitutio," infamous career. Thus made presentable even at a Dorcas society meeting, the passage, literally translated, is as follows: But a man of good reputation may demand and take as much as he pleases [when asked to do a dishonest or dishonorable act, for instance to swear falsely in a case at law]: the reason is, because in these and such like matters that have no fixed or customary remuneration, the thing [the perjury] can be sold for as high a price as it is thought to be worth by the one who sells. Now a man of good reputation can value his good reputation at a very high figure; hence you see that the man of notoriously bad reputation, of whom we spoke in the preceeding sub-section, could at the beginning of his infamous career take more [i. e. a higher remuneration]; but once the man of good reputation has set such or such a price on his good reputation, he must stand by that price, otherwise he would be selling at a price above the valuation.

Plainly we have here no condoning of perjury. The Jesuit theologian is not dealing with the question of perjury at all as such, but only of the perjurer's right to demand, and to take, and to keep the "wages of his sin;" and he treats the further truly supererogatory question whether once having cut prices on his "goods" he may justly scale prices up again. The simple-minded Jesuit very decidely says nay: but a "probable opinion" is that the perjurer will take all that he can get.—Translator.

Someone will perhaps say that such smutty specialities as are found above all in Gury are needful to the father confessor so that he may know whether and how far he may give absolution. Jesus, whose followers the Jesuits claim to be, thought not so. He said to the woman taken in adultery, Go and sin no more. With casuistries he would have nothing to do. And this searching into the details of sin is nothing to the purpose once unchastity has entered in. Earnest exhortation is then far to be preferred to the method of examination, being both more efficacious and more worthy of the Church, to say nothing of the danger both to the confessor and the penitent in certain circumstances. Innocent boys and girls may be led by the method of examination to harbor thoughts to which else they might have been strangers.

Lying holds an important place in the Jesuit system of morality, unfortunately rather as a thing allowed than a thing forbidden. The Jesuits permit to the accused and to witnesses in criminal causes so many twistings, mendacities and other perversions of the truth as would hamper the activity of courts enormously or even make criminal prosecution impossible. Sanchez even puts the case of a judge interrogating the accused in a way not according to the law, and the decision of the legality he leaves to the accused. And in the course of the Jesuit moralist's treatment of this point it is developed that when he speaks of a judge who puts unwarranted questions he means one who on account of his opinions does not stand well with the Church. But aside from this, Sanchez teaches that one may lie about a transaction when he has hopes of thus being acquitted, or of holding his vantage ground, or when he makes some mental reservation; so that in sum falsehood of every sort seems permitted. Under such circumstances perjury

also is expressly allowed by Sanchez ("Opus Morale in Praecepta Decalogi," lib. III, c. 6). Gury, it is true, forbids all lying, but permits, "for grave causes," the use of mental reservation and equivocal terms: here he quotes Saint Alphonsus de Liguori, who indeed was no Jesuit but was founder of a congregation similar to the Jesuit Society—that of the Redemptorists or Liguorians, and who was not ashamed to affirm that Jesus Christ himself used such artifices (Gury, "Casus Conscientiae," p. I., no. 415, p. 128). Thus to a Jesuit that which others regard as blasphemy of a divine person seems an act of praise. Jesus said, If one strike thee on one cheek turn to him the other. But his pretended followers, Fagundez, Filliucius, Escobar, Gury, and others, say that calumny may be repaid with calumny, railing with railing (Escobar, t. IV., p. 386); and this for the soul's welfare of the railer, to the end he be not overbearing and that others may regard him less. Nay it is even permissible to trump up a criminal charge against another so that one may himself escape the torture in court, or serious damage out of court (Sotus, Lessius, and others, quoted by Escobar, p. 373). Again, Escobar, Lessius, Navarra, and many others permit the opening of others' letters when one fears "mischief" from them, or for the reason of curiosity if one believes they contain "nothing of consequence". But should unexpected mischief result therefrom the inquisitive one is not held to any restitution (Escobar, p. 375). Gury holds the same opinion ("Compendium." p. I., p. 221).

This brings us to other transgressions against the love of the neighbor. Many Jesuit moralists permit a man by tale bearing and by making known another's faults to supplant that other in the favor of some person of quality; to desire an illness for a sinner to the end he may be converted, or his death so that his wrong

doing may have an end; to withhold from another the property you have unjustly taken from him, if he has reviled the doer of the wrong; to defame the dead; and so on (Escobar, p. 384, 388).

ADDENDUM.

We add here some observations that could not well be introduced in the preceeding chapter without impairing the continuity of discourse. The additional matter has reference to "Probabilism," and it is taken mainly from Döllinger and Reusch's "Geschichte der Moralstreitungen in der röm-kathol. Kirche seit dem 16ten Jahrhundert," 1889 (History of moral controversies in the R. C. Church since the 16th century).

The most dangerous and most significant feature of Probabilism is that it has not its prime origin in conscience, but in views and opinions that naturally diverge from one another. Probabilism therefore has many degrees, and in some of these exhibits a transition to principles different from its own. Now, suppose the question asked, Under what conditions may a person in practice adopt a given opinion regarding the morality of an act? there are different answers.

1. The answer of Probabilism, which is threefold. The answer of

a. lax Probabilism, or Laxism is:
"If there be any ground whatever for the opinion, or if it be not certain that it has no ground."

b. Probabilism in the stricter sense:
"If the opinion in question, though less probable, still rests on good ground."

c. The more rigorous Probabilism:
"If the opinion in question is nearly as probable as the opposite one."

2. Equiprobabilism answers:

"If the safer opinion and the less safe are both equally probable."

3. Probabiliorism:

"One may adopt the less safe opinion only when it is the more probable; but one may adopt the safer opinion though it be the less probable."

4. Tutiorism.

a. Tutiorism in the narrow sense answers: "One may adopt the less safe opinion only when it is the most probable."

b. The more rigorous Tutiorism, or "Rigorism" answers: "One must adopt the safer opinion even though the less safe opinion be more probable or even the most probable." (See Lehmkuhl," Theologia Moralis" I. p. 59).

We may formulate thus our view as opposed to all these: "A person must under all circumstances adopt the safest view and pay no regard to probability. But the safest view is always the one suggested by an educated conscience."

Probabilism is not primarily of Jesuit origin, nor is it taught exclusively by Jesuits, nor, finally, is it taught by all Jesuits. But it is the doctrine of by far a greater number of Jesuits than of non-Jesuits; and in the opposition to Probabilism very few Jesuits are numbered, so that one is justified in holding Probabilism and Jesuitism to be synonymous terms. Of course we speak here only of moralists; that in private life Probabilism is very largely followed by those who are not Jesuits at all we have already remarked (Chapt. v.)

The first probabilist who ever set up as teacher of morals (1567) was a Spanish Dominican, Bartholomew

de Medina. Among non-Jesuit moralists we find only fourteen probabilists of any note. The best known of these are the secular priest John Sanchez, the Regular Clerk Thomas Hurtado, the Cistercian friar John Caramuel, the Theatine friar Antony Diana, the Dominican Gregory Sayre, and the Oblate Martin Bonacina.

Of Jesuits who have opposed Probabilism, but who themselves advanced only as far as Probabiliorism, seven are mentioned, most of them little known, viz.: Ferdinand Rebello, Paul Comitoli, Andrew Bianchi: Bianchi, the most decided anti-Probabilist of the three was, significantly enough, refused leave by the Father-General to publish his work under his own name and in the name of the Society. The other four Jesuit opponents of Probabilism are: Louis de Scildere of Bruges, Michael de Elizalde a Spaniard, and later the Father-General Gonzalez and Camargo.

But by far the larger number of Jesuit moralists, and they the more notable authors, stand on the side of Probabilism. The list of these embraces 50 to 60 names, chief among them that of Escobar of whom it was said that he bought heaven dear and sold it to others cheap. After Escobar the most distinguished are: Gregory Vasquez (earliest Jesuit Probabilist), Navarra, Suarez, Thomas Sanchez, Toletanus, Henriquez, Peter and Caspar Hurtado, Francis and John de Lugo, Castro-Palao (these all Spanish); Emanuel Sa, Fagundez (both Potuguese); Figliuzzi, Baldello (Italian); Bauny, Pirot (French); Lessius, Silvius (Dutch); Layman, Busembaum (German). Molina, Valencia, and Azor wavered between Probabilism and Probabiliorism.

In the middle of the 17th century Probabilism (mostly because of Pascal's attacks on it in the "Letters Provinciales") suffered a notable decline, was frequently

condemned, and censured even by Rome, and many Jesuits sought to have the objectionable doctrine repudiated by the Society. But one of their number, Cardenas, defended the obnoxious propositions stoutly, and insisted that it is lawful to deny the sin one has committed, if one adds in thought to the spoken words (Cardenas, Dissertatio xix., c. 2, no. 14). The Dominicans repudiated Probabilism utterly, but the Jesuits clung to it only more firmly, and Thomas Tamburini carried the system to its last conclusions (1654), as also did Antony de Sarafa who taught (1667) that conscience may adopt the opinion of one learned man, and even that a man may follow the opinion of another though that be opposed to his own opinion; and that one may act on a probable opinion, rejecting the safer. But Antony Terillus, an Englishman (1668) was the laxest moralist of them all. The superiors of the Society refused to the Jesuit Elizalde permission to print his anti-Probabilist work, and Father-General Oliva threatened him with the severest punishment. Well he might, for Elizalde says of the writings of his opponents in the Society, "I sought Christ, he was not there. I sought love of God and the neighbor, it was not there. I sought the gospel, it was not there. I sought humility, it was not there. . . . The gospel is simple and opposed to all doubletonguedness: it knows only yea, yea, nay, nay. But the moralism of to-day is not simple, but employs your two-tongued Probabilism and combines the yea and the nay, for its rule is the probability of mutually contradictory propositions." The Jesuit Sanvitale denied to Elizalde both learning and virtue, and bluntly declared that an opponent of Probabilism had no right to belong to the Society of Jesus. So, too, Father-General Oliva reprimanded the Jesuit La Quintinye for having, for one thing, complained of

the evil consequences of Busembaum's moral doctrine; and the Jesuits plumed themselves on the facility of absolution in their confessionals (Döllinger and Reusch, p. 64). In their teaching with regard to confession most of the Jesuit casuists maintained the opinion that for absolution attrition, i. e. repentance for fear of hell, is enough, and that contrition, i. e., repentance for love of God, is not requisite; and the French Jesuit Tresse went so far as to declare that man is not obliged to love God (a proposition condemned by Alexander VIII.) In 1670 Thyrsus Gonzalez, a Jesuit, in his "Fundamentum Theologiæ Moralis," ventured to attack Probabilism, which was ever dominant in Spain, the birthland of the Society: he himself had advanced to Rigorism. But the Father-General Oliva thrice refused leave to print. Innocent XI. took up his cause, and with such effect that Gonzalez was even made Father-General in 1687. As he now wrote a new work against Probabilism, the Assistentes sought to hinder its publication: but Innocent XII. gave the imprimatur. Gonzalez died 1706, sick at heart because of the continual attacks of his opponents.

In the second half of the 18th century Probababilism met with further reverses, but remained still dominant among the Jesuits, who thereanent were constantly at strife with other theologians, particularly with the Dominicans. The parlement of Paris in 1762 had one hundred and sixty-three Jesuit works on moral theology burned.

The Jesuit Society having been suppressed by Clement XIV., Alphonsus de Liguori (born 1696 at Naples, deceased 1787, canonized 1839, declared doctor of the church 1871) continued the moral theology of the Jesuit Probabilists (so says the historian of the Society, Cretineau Joly, VI, 231): nay more, he procured its

official recognition by the Church that had so often combated it. For the Equiprobabilism of Liguori is hardly if at all distinguishable from the true Jesuit Probabilism; and to-day Jesuits and friends of the Jesuits laud Alphonsus de Liguori as a legitimate Probabilist. He permits equivocation, mental reservation, and under certain circumstances even perjury; also the right of secretly taking from another what you may believe he justly owes to you. His teaching was approved 1879 by Leo XIII.; and Gury, introduced in countless theological seminaries, rests entirely on Liguori. Thus has Probabilism, i. e. Jesuitism itself, been made the Church's teaching. Unquestionably the Church has the right to act thus: whether it is for her good the future will show. But the State, too, has the right, on the ground of strict morality, to keep at a distance the men who have smuggled into the Church a doctrine so objectionable, and so to give the Church to understand that the secular authority prefers the ancient and approved doctrine of morals to the newly imported article, which never can and never will be approved.

CHAPTER VI.

POLITICAL PRINCIPLES OF THE JESUITS

The Jesuits have at all times scorned to obey the State and the laws, where the State did not obey the Society or the law was not to their taste. The Jesuits Ozorius and Gretser maintained the Pope's right to set up and depose from their thrones emperors and kings. Our contemporary, Gury, teaches the "educated" ecclesiastics who get their moral theology from him, and the faithful who are led by them, not to obey laws that are opposed to the immunities of ecclesiastics and to the Church's laws; while on the other hand he holds that not only Catholics but all Christians should obey the laws of the Church, and declares these to be obligatory even when not recognized by the State (Gury, "Compendium Theologiæ Moralis," Part I, no. 91 sqq). In 1871 and 1872 the papal organ in Rome, Civilta

Cattolica, called the Pope supreme judge and lawgiver of Christendom; and the Jesuit Tarquini deduces concordats from the Pope's high station and not from treaty. Plainly a rightly ordered State should not tolerate such views, for with them it cannot subsist.

With regard to the customs laws, the Jesuits favor smugglers in every point. Gury and other authors leave it undecided whether the trade of these "shady gentlemen" is a sin or no, and releases them from any obligation of restitution to the defrauded government; nay they hold that one may distribute for pious uses the taxes or duties he withholds from the State. Gury is also very lenient toward poachers, and toward corrupt judges and court officers and fraudulent public servants; also toward deserters and all offenders against military discipline; but on the other hand he does not boggle at allowing "while the battle is not yet over" the killing of non-combatants, as women, aged men, travelers, clergymen, monks, and others, when so mixed up with the "guilty" [so he qualifies the soldiers] that the opposing host which has to be annihilated cannot be annilhated without involving these. ("Compendium," p. 193).

The Jesuits' understanding of freedom of the press differs from that of any modern State. Gury means by bad books and books to be prohibited, simply those which are "heretical," and of course all books are heretical which do not suit the Jesuits. He allows the circulation of such books only among "men learned and prudent" for the purpose of refutation. Whoever keeps or owns heretical books is to be excommunicated: and among "books" Gury reckons short pieces and even letters written by heretics, though they may contain no heresy. But whoever only listens to the reading of these, or reads but a little in them, or reads

to refute or to give them up to superiors does not incur the penalty ("Compendium," P. 11, no. 982).

But all this is as nothing compared with the treatment which the Jesuits would have the authorities administer to heretics, or those whom they esteem heretics. Beccanus, a Jesuit ("Opera," t. I. p. 353: Mayence 1649,) holds those persons to be still subject to the Church's jurisdiction who have quit the Church; invokes against "heretics" the major excommunication; heretics are to be stript of all dignities, and this deprivation should extend to their children and grandchildren; their estates should be confiscated; they should be incapable of inheriting property, of exercising the patria postestas, and so on; finally, Beccanus holds it to be the duty of the State, on behalf of the Church, to punish with death obstinate heretics. In our own time (1872) the Jesuit organ "Civilta Cattolica" has asserted the right of the Catholic Church to visit with the severest bodily punishments (and so with the stake) even Protestants and Greek Catholics. Quite consistently therefore the Jesuits and in particular Beccanus (op. cit., p. 362), and Paul Layman ("Theol. Moral.," t. I., p. 362: Wurtzburg, 1748) denounce religious liberty most emphatically, and declare it to be dangerous to the State. Hence to tolerate the Jesuits is to proscribe religious liberty.

Even in our own day the Jesuits are no less hostile to freedom of conscience. Their organ, "Civilta Cattolica," expressed delight over the fact that Pius IX. in his Encyclical and Syllabus of December 8th, 1864 anathematized "the whole modern view of the rights of conscience and of religious belief and profession," and added: "It is a grievous mistake to admit Protestants to equal political rights with Catholics, or to allow to Protestants free exercise of divine worship." The same

journal called (1869) liberty of conscience and religious liberty "madness and ruination;" and the Jesuit Liberatore, (1871) called them "pure insanity." Nay in 1891 the Jesuit Brunengo went so far as to laud the Inquisition and, in opposition to the teaching of the ultramontanes, to maintain its churchly origin and its churchly character; also to assert the Church's right even to decree temporal penalties. The same thesis was asserted in 1869 by the Jesuits Gerard Schneemann and Clement Schrader. And the famous Jesuit preacher Father Roh has heaped opprobrium on the the principle of toleration. By their fruits shall ye know them.

What the attitude of the Jesuits is towards State schools we learn from the acts of the party controlled by them. But Gury expressly declares that it is a mortal sin for Catholic parents to send their children to non-Catholic or godless schools, or to put them under non-Catholic or godless or morally corrupt teachers. Gury in one breath pronounces "heretics" and persons of scandalous lives and evil repute unfit to be sponsors in baptism. His opinion of mixed marriages is that of all Ultramontanes and, like most of the views of that party, is incompatible with peace between denominations in a State where all chuches stand on an equality.

But the Jesuits have never inquired whether their teachings be compatible with the constitution of the State, but have always worked against every government that did not blindly submit to them. Hence all the Jesuits that have written of government give an affirmative decision on the question whether it be lawful to slay a tyrant. But it is to be noted that by the word tyrant they never mean a ruler who governs for the advantage of their order, be he never so bloodthirsty and cruel, and though he trample right and justice in the

mire; for the Jesuit, a tyrant is a ruler who does not live as the Church wills, and in particular as the Jesuits will: hence an enlightened monarch, though his rule may be mildness itself. The Jesuit Rainold in express terms declares "heretical" princes to be the worst tyrants. The Jesuit Mariana writing of this subject says: "We do not inquire what men do but what the laws of nature allow, and according to them it is indifferent whether you kill with the dagger or with poison" ("De Rege et Regis Institutione," cap. 4). Says Bishop Bouvier of Mans, whom Gury loves to quote as an authority "Subjects must do battle against, besiege, pursue, yes, slay the usurper as a public malefactor, whenever the legitimate prince requires it" ("Institut. Philos." t III., p. 628). Regicide was also defended by the Jesuits Rosseus, Delrio, Bellarmin, Salmeron, Valencia, Azor, Soto, Busembaum, Suarez, Lessius, Toletanus, Tanner, Escobar, Molina, Lugo, and many others. Hence it is a lie to assert that Mariana is the only Jesuit that has done this. Mariana rejoiced over the assassination of Henry III. of France—a despicable creature to be sure—and called his slayer Clement "the everlasting ornament of Gaul" ("De Rege," etc. I. 6). But Mariana lived in Spain under Philip II.! Why did he not apply his theories to that tyrant? After the assassination of Henry IV. the Father-General Acquaviva promulgated, it is true, an edict against regicide, but limited himself to saying, "Not to e v e r y o n e is it permitted to slay kings." So little weight had the edict that many of the Jesuits named above belong to the period subsequent to its promulagation. Only quite recently did the Jesuit Gury repudiate regicide.

In the Middle Age the Knights Templar conceived a scheme for cutting off princes and obtaining the mastery of the world through an aristocracy of their own

membership. In accordance with the spirit of this most progressive age the Jesuits are attempting the same thing with the aid of democracy, and hence to-day in Germany and Switzerland the Jesuits and Democrats are political confederates.

It was a marvellously true insight that led the Jesuits long before the French Revolution to see in the people the main reliance of the Society, and to teach the doctrine of the people's sovereignty. The Jesuit Bellarmin was right when he said the form of the political power, whether monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, depends necessarily on man's nature; but the political power itself rests on the whole mass of the people; for by nature one man has no superiority over another; hence the power of the whole body is of divine right (juris divini). The Jesuit Mariana from this drew the inference that it is for the people to order the government and to do away hereditary monachy, since that makes the personality of the ruler a matter of chance. Therefore a monarch, if he abuses his power, may be deposed and punished with death. It is seen that the English revolutionists of 1649 and the French of 1793 were docile pupils of the Jesuits. But in maintaining the people's sovereignty the fathers of the Society were by no means concerned for the welfare of the people; their sole object was to use the people as a means of attaining the Society's ends as against the prince, so that they themselves might rule in the prince's stead. As the Templars wished to establish an aristocratic Templar kingdom so the Jesuits aim to set up a democratic empire under papal and Catholic style and title, the real power, however, remaining in Jesuit hands. And the plan is shrewdly conceived; for no earthly power has ever known so well the art of holding nations in check and of guiding

them by leading strings, of playing on their sensibilities and lulling their understanding to sleep, as the Roman Catholic Church since she came under Jesuit influence.

As Count Hoensbroech shows in the work already quoted, Jesuitism suppresses, even annihilates in a certain degree, the righteous sentiment of nationality, the patriotic spirit. "From his entry into the order till his life's end it is constantly impressed on the Jesuit that he exists for the whole world, not for this nation or that; this is brought home to him in practice by his being sent into countries the most diverse. . . . Such are the reasons which decided me to quit the order of Jesuits: one thing I regret, that I did not long ago let such considerations influence me."

CHAPTER VII.

RELIGION OF THE JESUITS.

The moralists of the Society of Jesus, in their teaching, tend to impair not only the moral law, but even those precepts of the Church, which, according to the express purpose of their Society, they should defend. In the matter of the observance of the Lord's day, holidays, and fast-days, they allow so many exceptions that the Church's precepts are in fact nullities. Escobar, Busembaum, Layman, Tamburini, and others, teach that one is not obliged to assist at the whole mass, that it suffices to hear a part of it; that it is al-

lowable to converse during the mass if one do but keep his eyes fixed on the altar. To be present at the divine service bodily though the thoughts may be wandering elsewhither, is enough, if the behavior in other respects is proper; and a man does not miss the purpose of his presence at mass, if while there he keeps eyeing the women or even meditating criminal designs. The theologians Bauny and Sanchez permit a priest to say mass on the same day he commits mortal sin. Gury permits him to play a game of chance with a layman for the price of masses, and to pay his creditor in masses to be said for the creditor ("Compendium," p. 142). Thus is the mass lowered to the grade of common wares and money values. Jesuits allow the use of ambiguous expressions and of mental reservation in the confessional; nay they permit downright lying; also the concealing of a sin if it has been included in a general confession; the choice of another confessor so as to stand well in the estimation of the usual confessor; and so on.

For the Jesuits even the infallibility of the Pope is of no account save within the bounds of their theory of probability, and has effect only after the Pope's enunciations have been interpreted and understood: for example, if the Pope denies right of asylum to bandits, the decree is inoperative if asylum is afforded not to abet the robbery but out of—kindness (!); and the church's privilege of asylum is enjoyed even by those who begin an act of crime in the neighborhood of a church, so that they may at once avail themselves of the privilege.

Regarding oaths also many Jesuits have peculiar notions. Escobar, Busembaum, Cardenas, Sanchez, Suarez, Layman, and others, hold that "an oath taken only outwardly, without the intention of being under

oath" need not be kept (Escobar, t. IV., p. 106) .That will practically excuse all perjuries. The fathers just named furthermore allow all kinds of equivocation in oaths; and on this point the opinions of Castro-Palao, Sanchez, Navarra, and Hurtado, are specially notable. Gury indeed expresses himself more guardedly, but his teaching is essentially the same. ("Compendium," p. 151).

Clearly such principles are irreconcilable with a faith resting on conviction; and it is safe to assume that the superiors in the Jesuit order are entirely without faith; that they make use of the Catholic Church only because by her wide diffusion over the world she affords a powerful agency adapted for the attaining of their ends: and here they remind us forcibly of the Knights Templar. They feign obedience to the Pope, whereas he is rather their tool; they feign a hatred for heresy, because were they openly to profess heretical views, the Catholics would no longer suffer themselves to be deceived by them. The Jesuits accordingly are not only enemies of enlightenment, which can be genuine only when associated with sound and true morality, and when it openly declares its ends and why it pursues them: they are furthermore enemies of the Catholic Church, because the Church cannot exist without morality. Hence if the Jesuits, with the help of the Catholic Church shall ever win their object of attaining great power, and shall attain complete control of that Church, so as to have no longer any occasion for veiling their real purposes, then surely it will be all over with the Catholic faith: but the result will be only hypocrisy and general demoralization.

For the aims of the Jesuits are purely selfish, contemplating only the advantage of the Society in the acquisition of power and wealth. Neither mankind nor

the Church can be benefited, inasmuch as the carrying out of the principles of the Society would be the ruin of both.

How the Jesuits understand the Christian virtue of humility is shown by the belief prevalent among them that no Jesuit will be damned, but that all members of the Society will go to heaven. As late as 1874 James Terrien, a French Jesuit, published a book in which he says: "It is a tradition dating back to the earliest days of the Society and faithfully preserved among us, that to persevere in our vocation is a sure pledge of salvation; and that to find favor before God's judgment seat it is enough that one die as a child of Saint Ignatius." According to the tradition this comforting promise was revealed to the Father-General Francis Borgia and other members or pious friends of the Society. (For the particulars see Döllinger and Reusch, "Geschichte der Moralstreitungen in der R. K. Kirche," I. 524, II. 347).

And as the Jesuits have a salvation all their own, so too they have a peculiar worship. In this there is almost no mention of God, and of Christ but little. The worship practiced by the Jesuits and by those influenced by them is directed to the Virgin Mary (who holds the first place throughout), to Peter, and to the heart of Jesus as an object totally distinct from the Redeemer himself. By the heart of Jesus they do not at all mean "heart" in a spiritual sense—the soul of Jesus or his love—but just the bodily heart of flesh alleged to have appeared in the 17th century to the ecstatic nun Margaret Mary Alacoque, and which has a place of pilgrimage of its own at the village of Paray le Monial in France. After a while the heart of Mary and the heart of Joseph were associated with the heart of Jesus, and now special prayers are addressed to the

three hearts. Later the cult of Saint Ann was added. We are by no means without respect for the pious belief of the people; with that we have not to do here, but with a modern idolatry devised by the Jesuits for their own ambitious ends. The people were for centuries pious and devout before these innovations appeared; and are not made more devout by these means, but only befooled and turned aside from the central point of religion. She who called herself "the Lord's handmaid" is made into a goddess; and quite needlessly and stupidly the "heart" of holy personages is taken as a thing distinct from the personages themselves and made the object of an idolatry which would be comical were it not so sad. But the thing becomes absolutely revolting when the "sacred heart" is invoked in the cause of la revanche and to aid France in her quarrel with Germany. Periodicals are published at Paris and at Innsbruck expressly in honor of the "sacred heart." The May-devotions, so-called, are also an invention of the Jesuits, and are degenerating into a formal idolatry of Mary.

An ex-Jesuit writes thus of the Jesuit cult: "The Jesuits have on the whole seriously impaired the grandeur and dignity of Catholic worship. The pompous and for the most part senseless tricking out of their churches and services make on every unprejudiced observer the impression of silly ostentation in ornament and of self-complacent coquetry: and that impression is true. Their one object is to outdo all others, to attract everyone to their churches and there to hold them, and so to gain credit for the most imposing religious service, though it is not God who is honored thereby, but rather themselves. . . The music in the Jesuit churches is the most trivial and tasteless to be found, it is the extreme opposite of the old Church chant with

its gravity and dignity. Pope Gregory and maestro Palestrina would tear their hair were they to hear such scandalous performances."

In their religious exercises the Jesuits, as Count Hoensbroech shows (p. 20) tolerate none but specifically Jesuit devotions. "The novice gets only books of devotion, written by Jesuits, and in hagiology may read only lives of Jesuit saints. There is the ring of Jesuit thought and expression in the prayer of the Pharisee, I thank thee, O Lord, that I am not like other men., . . . One man's idea of piety—Loyola's—must be stamped on the minds of all members of his society."

CHAPTER VIII.

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND SCHOLARSHIP OF THE JESUITS.

Jesuit education is no more intended to enhance the glory of science and scholarship than Jesuit politics to promote the welfare of the people, or Jesuit religion to spread abroad a sound faith. Even their educational establishments serve only to add to the Society's power and influence. The first noteworthy institution of learning founded by the Jesuits was the Collegium Romanum, 1551; The next year Pope Julius III, at the suggestion

of Loyola, approved the founding of the Collegium Germanicum, the object of which was to train combatants for the struggle with Protestantism in Germany. Out of a Jesuit idea grew the decree of the Council of Trent, that after the pattern of these two institutions should be established in every diocese a preparatory seminary, i. e., a school where aspirants to the Catholic priesthood might be trained for their calling from their tender years.

The educational system of the Jesuits is based on the "Ratio studiorum et institutiones scholasticæ Societatis Jesu" (Plan of Studies and Scholastic Institutions of the Society of Jesus) which was drawn up 1588; published 1599, by Father-General Claudius de Acquaviva: revised and amended, to meet the demands of the time, by Father-General John Roothaan 1832; and edited anew by Father Pachtler 1887. According to the "Ratio" a Jesuit educational institution has two divisions, Studia superiora and Studia inferiora. Each division has a prefect, and over both is the rector. The Studia inferiora comprise five classes: Rudiments, Grammar, Syntax (now designated Lower, Middle, and Higher Grammar), Humanities, and Rhetoric: each occupies one to two years. The main purpose of this division (Studia inferiora) is to teach the Latin language—not its laws of syntax, but the use of the language itself and to give facility in speaking and writing it. From the syntax class onward teacher and pupils must speak Latin only. Hence the motto of the Jesuit schools "Lege, scribe, loquere" (read, write, speak). This end the Jesuits hold to be reached by cramming the pupil's memory with locutious, collections of which relating to all sorts of objects are made. Among the first duties of the pupils is to say the "rosary" daily; and they must confess monthly. The mother tongue of the pupils was till 1832

strictly banned in Jesuit schools, and still is neglected. Formerly use of the mother tongue was visited with punishment, which one could escape only by informing against a fellow student guilty of the same fault: and in Jesuit schools to each student is assigned by the prefect an aemulus (competitor), appointed by the prefect, with whom he is to compete in his studies. The ancient classics were only and solely for forming the style, without regard to the spirit of the writings; hence Cicero is venerated as the highest ideal of these schools. Out of Vergil the students put together Latin verses; and they act Latin plays, but not such as those of Plautus and Terence, but plays of their own composition. Greek, too, is learned, even with the intention of speaking it and writing verses. The Jesuits place the Greek and Latin fathers on equality with the ancient classics. All other learning, beyond the ancient languages, the Jesuits grouped together under the title "crudition"—an omnium gatherum of all manner of anecdotes and memoranda collected indiscriminately from the most diverse branches of knowledge. Till the year 1832 the Jesuits' schools knew nothing of instruction in the natural sciences; and such instruction as is now given is made to conform to religious direction, and is neither exhaustive nor systematic. Historical study is still conducted on lines laid down by the Church's teaching, and not as an independent branch of science.

The Studia superiora consist of a "philosophical" course of two or three years, followed by a four-years course of theology. In philosophy the teaching follows Aristotle "so far as he does not come in conflict with the Church's doctrine;" it aims particularly at refuting the philosophic systems that are opposed to the "true faith." In choosing between diverse opinions theology must always shed light on the matter first. In mathe-

matics the schools down to 1852 clung to Euclid, but in Euclid restricted themselves to "what the students like to hear." But now this branch is taught in the modern way. In theology the Vulgate Bible is the groundwork; the original texts and other translations are consulted only for the sake of comparison. In Church History it must be made to appear that the rights of the Church and of her head rest on the most ancient foundations.

Now to say nothing of the overmuch time given to practices of devotion and the spiritual exercises, which must needs interfere with scholarly activity, there can be no such thing as freedom and independence of thought and research where the plan of study, like the spiritual exercises, is contrived for the purpose of making of the students blindly obedient and devoted tools of the order, machines that will beforehand refuse to have any thought or judgment of their own. It is all a mechanical process of training: the students do not enter into the spirit of Roman antiquity at all (to say nothing of Grecian); and the men of antiquity, the classics, are made known to the students only through castrated editions, from which everything is omitted that might in any wise be prejudicial to Jesuit purposes. On the other hand by lessons in deportment and in dancing, by all sorts of bodily exercises and by theatrical exhibitions, the public is blinded and led to believe that the instruction given is of the highest class, whereas these accomplishments serve only to fit the Jesuit for playing on occasion the part of the man of the world; for he must assume all possible disguises as the purposes of the Society may require. For the rest, in order to accustom the pupils of the Jesuits to the thought that they belong to the Society alone, love toward parents and kindred is systematically stifled in

them. "After seven years of study," says Count Hoensbroech (p. 33), the young Jesuit completes his education, armed with all the philosophico-theological acumen of past ages, his head filled with the names of systems long dead and of medieval scholars now without any influence, but knowing absolutely nothing of the intellectual conflicts of to-day or of the present currents in science; the scientific men of the time and their works he hardly knows even by name. . . . If a studious Jesuit wishes to read anything the library is not at his disposal though he be a man of mature years; he must go to his superiors, and according to their good pleasure his wish will be fulfilled or not: the narrowmindedness of the superiors will very often prevail of course.

The scientific achievements of the Jesuits are on a par with their schools. As in their schools so in science they occupy a peculiar position quite separate and apart from the progressive development of civilization. Therefore they cannot permit Jesuits to be educated by other than fellow-Jesuits, or to be tested as to their acquisition of knowledge. Thus as early as 1552 they obtained of Pope Julius III. the privilege of conferring on their pupils, after the manner of universities, the degree of bachelor, master, licentiate, and doctor; and the privilege was confirmed by Pius IV., 1561 Nevertheless the Jesuit institutions, though styled universities, were never complete schools of higher education: they comprised only the faculties of theology and "liberal arts" (now designated "philosophy").

Let us now see what is the value of the literature of the Jesuit order, cultivated and fostered by their schools.

In Church History Caesar Baronius, native of Campagna (born 1538, died 1607) passes among Jesuits as an authority. He was not indeed a member of the

Society but was a man in all respects like-minded with them: in his enormously voluminous "Annales Ecclesiastici" the history of the Church is so presented that everything makes in favor of the Roman Church, even at the cost of the truth. The Jesuit Robert Bellarmin (born in Tuscany 1542, died 1621), in his principal work "De Controversiis Fidei", was the advocate of unconditional blind obedience to the Pope, and as such thoroughly falsified history.

As Döllinger ("Das Papsttum", newly revised by J. Friedrich, Munich 1892) proves, the Jesuits have at all times defended falsifications of Church History and have themselves falsified it. Thus, Suarez, Gretser, Possevin, Valencia, and Turrianus asserted the genuineness of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, of the 9th century—a spurious collection of papal decrees purporting to establish the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy over all kingdoms. The Spanish Jesuit Romanus de la Higuera produced spurious chronicles and relics to prove the antiquity of the belief in papal infallibility and in the immaculate conception of Mary. Ballarmin, Delrio, and Halloix defended the pseudo-Dionysian writings; Canisius fabricated letters of the Virgin Mary; and so on.

With regard to general history, we have already seen, in Baronius and Bellarmin, how Jesuits deal with historical facts. To the same effect is the fact that not less than nine Jesuits in the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth came forward to prove the genuineness of a letter purporting, according to the legend, to have been written by the Virgin Mary to the congregation at Messina: it is in Greek (!). In commemoration of the miracle holiday is still kept at Messina every year on the third of June, and very many children are christened "Lettera". The great Jesuit writer of history is the Spaniard John de Mariana (born

at Talavera 1536) who composed a history of Spain in 30 books. It is written in a graceful style, but the work is quite uncritical; it begins with Cain's decendant Tubal, from whom the Spaniards are alleged to be decended. This history was first published at Mayence 1601–1605. Mariana's treatise, already mentioned, "De Rege et Regis Institutione" was burned by the common hangman by order of the parlement of Paris, but as this embittered the French against the Jesuits, the Society disowned Mariana, and the Inquisition had him cast into prison on account of certain theological writings, and placed the writings on the Index. He was dealt with the more severely because among his papers was found a piece written in Spanish, on "the disorders of the Society of Jesus" (already quoted under its Latin title "De Morbis S. J.")

The great majority of Jesuit writers are theologians. The earlier of these are of no consequence for our time, save such of them as have written of morals and politics, and these we considered in former chapters. Even the latest Jesuit treatises on theology, such notable works, for example, as Father Franzelin's "Theologia Dogmatica" (6 vols.) really belong to the Middle Age.—But there are many Jesuit writers on Geography and on the languages of the people among whom the Society has conducted missions; some mathematicians also, and natural philosophers, among them Athanasius Kircher. Kircher made several technical discoveries of much importance in that age (17th century). In our own day the Jesuit order has had one very learned historian, Damberger, who counted on the aid of the Society in the publication of his great work: but after his death the Jesuits s o l d h i s M S S., instead of bringing the work to completion. Father Angelo Secchi, of Rome, won great distinction as an astrono-

mer, but in his labors he had no fellow-workers. In art, aesthetics, and history of literature, also in critical general history and history of civilization the Jesuits can point to several brilliant and graceful writers, members of the order, especially the contributors to the periodical publication "Stimmen aus Maria Laach." But the works of these go only to show that the Jesuits, now as ever, labor only to lead the world back to Catholicism, to papal ideas, and that whatever does not look in that direction they do whatever they can to discredit and destroy. For anyone not a thoroughpaced Ultramontane the literature of the Maria Laach school is absolutely insipid: here is no science, but simply foregone conclusions and propaganda. The same remark applies to other Jesuit periodicals—"Civilta Cattolica" in Italy, "Etudes Religieuses" in France, the "Month" in England. In sum, with all the show and glitter the one end is simply the catholicizing and Romanizing of the world. But such end is inconsistent with the dignity of science and the peace of states in which all creeds are equal; in purely Catholic countries, were the governments to recognize it, there would be a return to the Inquisition.

What Jesuits mean by logic is shown by Father Clement Schrader's book "Der Papst und die modernen Ideen" (The Pope and Modern Ideas, 1866). In that work he especially defends the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864. The propositions condemned in the Syllabus —which as we know are imaginary propositions such as the Curia thought m i g h t occur in liberalist works, and which therefore represent views just opposite to those of the Pope—these propositions the author makes more plain to the Ultramontane public by setting alongside of them the "contrary propositions," which present the papal view. But these counter propositions are so

scrupulously cast in the form of the condemned propositions that by the insertion of a "not" or by other trifling change a ludicrous effect is usually produced. Take for example the 34th condemned proposition: "The doctrine of those who compare the Roman pontiff to an independent prince exercising his authority in the entire Church, is a doctrine which prevailed in the Middle Age." In condemning this entirely true proposition Pius IX. plainly meant to say that this doctrine not only prevailed in medieval times, but should prevail in these days as well. But Father Clement Schrader simply inserted a negative particle ("non," not) at "prevailed" (prævaluit), and thus unintentionally denied the doctrine of papal supremacy even with regard to the Middle Age. (The text of the proposition is as follows in the syllabus, the "non" being Father Schrader's insertion: Doctrina comparantium romanum pontificem principi libero et agenti in universa ecclesia, doctrina est quae medio aevo [non] praevaluit.) The 38th condemned proposition runs thus: "The too arbitrary acts [arbitria] of Roman pontiffs have contributed to the division of the Church into Eastern and Western;" and Father Schrader by putting "not" between "have" and "contributed" in effect qualifies the conduct of the Popes as arbitrary. The 76th proposition is: Abrogatio civilis imperii quo apostolica sedes potitur ad ecclesiae libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conduceret; that is, Abrogation of the civil kingship enjoyed by the Holy See would conduce in the very highest degree to the freedom and the happiness of the Church. Schrader inserts "non" before "conduceret." So, then, abrogation etc. would not conduce in the highest degree! But doubtless it would in a low degree, or to some extent! "But" some one may reply, "Schrader is only one Jesuit."

Clement Schrader is somewhat more than that: inasmuch as he was chosen to glorify the pontifical acts of Pius IX. in a bulky volume, he must be regarded as an official spokesman of his Society and of the Roman system. And such are the "acute logicans" whose "learning," as an Ultramontane journal asserts, fills the liberals with alarm ! Risum teneatis ?

But apart from such proofs of "scientific culture" as this, which give unmistakable evidence of degeneration, the Jesuits shut themselves out of the domain of research by the homage they ever pay to the lowest superstitions. Not only did the early Jesuits, like their contemporaries, all believe in witchcraft and exorcisms: their fellow Jesuit Gury teaches those pleasing doctrines in our own day as indubitable facts. He is a believer in the divining-wand, but cautions us against the "demonic influence" that may be associated with it ("Compendium" P. i. no. 270). He believes in sorcery practiced with the help of the devil, in witchcraft as the art of doing injury to others with the help of the devil, e. g., of awakening in another sentiments of hate, or sinful desire, or of producing disease or imbecility. In the tricks of table-tipping and spirit-rapping he scents "evil spirits of God accurst;" so-called animal magnetism, too, he regards as a satanic operation. He gives directions for exorcizing and casting evil spirits out of persons or things possessed, and even credits the devil with sending some dreams. In comparison with this we may consider other parts of his teaching harmless, as when he recommends the wearing of blest medals, pictures and relics of saints, and approves the observation of the moon or of the passing seasons when herbs are to be collected for medicinal uses; and so on. The Jesuit Bouniot declared in 1889 that the heathen gods were actually, really, demons, asserted possession by

evil spirits as a fact, and defended the opinion that in animal magnetism and spiritism devils play a part.

In the whole course of their history the Jesuits can claim only two of their members opposed to the burning of witches, namely Adam Tanner (and he only in a mild degree), and Frederic von Spe. Spe, who was also a poet, by his "Cautio Criminalis," which appeared in 1631 anonymously and without permission of superiors, was one of the first pioneers in the work of abolishing the cruel practice. He met an early death 1635 through his devoted care of the wounded in battle. The Jesuits take overmuch credit to themselves for the services of this man; but they shrewdly refrain from all mention of one of the most zealous upholders of trials for witchcraft, Martin Antony Delrio, a Jesuit, native of Spain but resident of Belgium (born 1551, died 1608). His work "Disquisitiones Magicæ," three volumes, published 1593 with permission of superiors, is, next after the "Maul for Witches." (Malleus Maleficarum) the most terrible book ever written against the wretched women called witches; and it is full of the most indecent calumnies against the sex.

Were the Jesuits to have free entry to us and greater influence, how long would it be before they would bring back trials for witchcraft? Verily here is a body of men whose "learning" is less to be feared than their fanaticism.

CHAPTER IX.

PRO AND CONTRA.

The present writer is by no means disposed to ignore the services of the Jesuits. We have already taken occasion to mention some of their good work; and if more has not been said of the better side of the Society, that is because of the confessed purpose of this volume, to warn the people against the readmission of the Jesuits into Germany and Switzerland. In the propagation of Christianity in the far East, especially in China and Japan, the Jesuits have rendered great services. In 1692 they obtained from the Emperor Kang-hi religious freedom for Christians; they taught the Chinese mathematics and astronomy; but in the 18th century, in consequence of quarrels with other religious orders and differences with the court of Rome, they were expelled. In Japan they had already in 1581 150,000 Christian disciples, but the Society was expelled 1639, and many of the Jesuits died the martyr's death manfully. They were able to show grand results in the East Indies during the 16th and 17th centuries, but these results disappeared on the fall of the Portuguese dominion. In Abyssinia they converted the Negus, 1604, but in the course of the same century they were driven out. Many

Jesuits died 1561, as witnesses unto death of the truth of the Christian religion, in the negro kingdom then called Monomotapa, in Africa. But it was in South America that they attained the summit of their power. Out of the aboriginal dialects they compacted one general language which is understood throughout Brazil; and in Paraguay they founded a great State in which admirable order and just laws reigned. In North America they explored Canada and settled California. But everywhere it was charged against them, chiefly by Catholics, and even by Popes, that they owed their success to the blending of Christianity with the religions of the people among whom they labored.

Of course, while conducting all these enterprises the Jesuits, that is to say their missionaries, had to endure endless hardships. And these, as well as the many enmities they incurred in Europe, in part undeservedly, but in part also deservedly, they bore with high heroic spirit. Yet from all this and from all the facts previously mentioned it follows of necessity that only in distant lands among populations of little culture, and in Europe only in earlier times, can the Jesuits, or could they, do any real service. As regards Europe at this day they are both outpaced and outsoared. Without them and their influence the Catholic Church would attain a far higher purity and would command a higher reverence. In science they cannot point to one man among their members who could compete on any terms with the coryphaei of the several branches. In care for the sick the Johannites, deaconesses, and Sisters of Charity far surpass them. In political affairs, wherever they were engaged in them, they have in these times produced only confusion, though here perhaps the zeal of their adherents may be more to blame than the Society itself. Their lax moral teaching is stillthe same as it ever was,

as is shown by the works of Father Gury, who has given up only the justification of tyrannicide. That being so, vain are the efforts of Cretineau-Joly and of the German polyhistor Francis Joseph Buss, to prove the innocence of the Society: the lax moralists of the Society are forgotten, thought they. Yes indeed, it would have been better to forget them, but Gury and his school have taken pains to remind the world once again of their teachings.

THE END.