

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors "

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXXI.—JULY, 1906—No. 123.

PIUS VI. AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

II.

THE encroachments on the liberties of the Church and the interference in ecclesiastical matters which had distinguished the administration of Tanucci were continued under that of the Marquis della Sambuca, a Sicilian nobleman who had been for some years Ambassador at the Court of Vienna, and whom Queen Maria Carolina selected as less likely to be under the influence of the King of Spain. His opposition to the unimpeded exercise of the authority of the Holy See was quite as decided as that of his predecessor, for not only was the Royal *Exequatur* still declared to be required before a Papal brief containing a dispensation could be admitted into the country, but it was also enacted that it should not be granted unless the King's permission to apply to Rome for the dispensation had been previously obtained.¹ A list was even published in 1778 of the various matters for which it had always been customary to apply to Rome for a dispensation, and it was notified that for no less than 78 of these leave to do so would thenceforth be refused. In pursuance of the same policy the provincials of the mendicant orders were prohibited in the following year from receiving novices for the space of ten years; a number of religious houses were suppressed in Calabria

¹ Rev. Mario Rinaldi, S. J., "Della Rovina di una Monarchia," Torino, 1901. *Introduzione*, p. lxi.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1906, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

in 1783, and four convents of the Olivatan Order in Sicily were closed in 1784 and their revenues confiscated. The right of nomination to twenty-five sees in the Kingdom of Naples had been granted by Pope Clement VII. to the Emperor Charles V., but Ferdinand claimed the right of nominating to every see, abbey or benefice by a simple decree, and up to the year 1779 about three hundred such decrees had already been issued. In fact, under the influence of della Sambuca the Neapolitan Church had been so much disorganized and so much discontent and insubordination excited among the religious orders, that the kingdom was rapidly drifting into a schism; the more so because some of the Bishops, through pusillanimity or from interested motives, sided with the King and submitted without resistance or protest to his aggressions on the rights of the Church.²

The result was that many sees remained vacant, as the Sovereign Pontiff refused to accept the ecclesiastics nominated by the Crown, and della Sambuca went so far as to say that he would have their spiritual jurisdiction conferred on them by a synod of Neapolitan Bishops; but as those whom he consulted on the matter pointed out to him that the people would refuse to acknowledge prelates who had not been lawfully appointed by the Holy See, he desisted from his project.³

As all the conditions stipulated by the Concordat of 1741 had been thus disregarded and broken by the Neapolitan Government, Pius VI. in 1782 sought to induce King Ferdinand to revise it and to come to a new agreement which should restore order in the Church and terminate the disputes with regard to the collation of benefices. Della Sambuca, however, delayed so long before replying to this proposal that the Pope perceived that his object was to make still further inroads on the liberties of the Church, and then to have them accepted as established rights before coming to any understanding with Rome.⁴

What Pius VI. had foreseen came to pass when, in 1785, he again made overtures to the Neapolitan Government, for the Minister demanded as a preliminary to any discussion that the Sovereign Pontiff should first approve of all the usurpations of the Crown and the regulations with regard to ecclesiastical matters which had been enacted up to that time, and his insistence on this condition put an end to the negotiations.⁵

The career of the Sicilian statesman was, however, drawing to its close, since for some time he had had a dangerous rival at the Court of Naples, who finally succeeded in supplanting him. This

² *Ibid.*, p. lxi.

³ Rinaldi, *ibid.*, p. lxi.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. lxiii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-22.

was John Edward Acton, usually known as le Chevalier or General Acton, born at Besançon, where his father, a descendant of a younger branch of an old Shropshire family, the Actons of Aldenham Hall, and who had accompanied the historian Gibbon on his travels as his physician, had established himself and married. His son had entered the French navy, but having been disappointed with regard to promotion, he left it and entered the service of Leopold I., Grand Duke of Tuscany. Having been given the command of a frigate in 1773, he distinguished himself in several encounters with the Corsairs of the North African States, and especially in the Spanish expedition led by Count O'Reilly against Algiers in 1775. There he commanded the two vessels sent by Tuscany, and by the daring with which he took up a dangerous position and the skill with which he directed the fire of his ships, he rescued the Spanish army, which had been surrounded by the Moors.⁶ Invited to Naples in 1778 by Ferdinand IV., he was soon named Minister of Marine, and in that capacity displayed much activity. He built dockyards, founded a naval academy and soon created a fleet of four ships of the line, ten frigates and 128 smaller vessels. The Ministry of War was then entrusted to him, when he reorganized the Neapolitan army, which he raised to 50,000 men, and shortly afterwards the administration of the finances of the kingdom was placed in his hands.

The control which the King of Spain exercised over Neapolitan affairs and of which the prosecution of the Freemasons had been a consequence, was the chief cause of the hostility which soon arose between della Sambuca and Acton, for della Sambuca, a diplomatist of the old school,⁷ was inclined to follow Tanucci's example and submit in everything to the dictates of Charles III., while Acton sought to render King Ferdinand independent of his father. This policy was also that of Queen Maria Carolina, who, guided by her brothers, Joseph and Leopold, aimed at replacing the influence of Madrid by that of Vienna. The dispute soon became still more embittered and two parties were formed at the court—the Spaniards, or partisans of Charles III., and the anti-Spaniards, or "Royalists," who wished to see the King freed from all foreign interference.⁸ Charles III. made

⁶ Antonio Zobi, "Storia Civile della Toscana," Firenze, 1850. Vol. II., p. 210.

⁷ J. A. von Melfert, "Zeugenerher über Maria Karolina," in *Archiv. für Oesterreichischer Geschichte*, 1879. Vol. LVIII., p. 293.

⁸ A. von Arneth, "Joseph II. und Leopold von Toscana. Ihr Briefwechsel von 1781 bis 1790." Wien, 1872. Vol. I., p. 304. Léopold à Joseph, 15 October, 1785: "La cabale ourdite contre Acton et contre la Reine à Sambuca et presque tous les seigneurs de la Cour à la tête, et tous les Siciliens, et ce qui s'appelle à Naples le parti Espagnol qui y est fort nombreux." P. 314, 23d Nov., 1705. The same to the same: "Le parti de Sambuca est victorieux, domine et menace tout le monde, quoique le Roi le haïssa: Seton a la fièvre continue et ne demande que son congé."

every effort to induce his son to send away General Acton, of whose desire to establish friendly relations with England and Austria rather than with France and Spain he was well aware,⁹ while Joseph II. assured the Queen that the dismissal of the general would be an act of injustice and of shameful weakness in the face of all Europe.¹⁰ The complicated network of intrigues to which for some years this quarrel gave rise and in which the principal courts of Europe took part, caused at last della Sambuca to offer his resignation on January 3, 1786. It was at once accepted, and the Marquis Domenico Caracciolo, then Viceroy of Sicily, was named in his place as Secretary for Foreign Affairs, while Acton and the Marquis de Marco, the Minister of Justice and of Ecclesiastical Affairs, a bitter enemy of Rome, were given seats at the Council of State.¹¹

The Marquis Caracciolo (1715-1789) belonged to a younger branch of the house of the Princes of Avellino, and before he was sent to govern Sicily he had been for some years Ambassador in London and in Paris. From the former of these two capitals he seems to have brought away only unfavorable impressions,¹² but in Paris he found himself in more congenial surroundings among philosophers and encyclopedists such as d'Alembert Holback, Helvetius, whose works he had studied and with whom he had corresponded. His opinions agreed fully with theirs, for he was heard to boast that if he should ever become Minister at Naples he would know how to emancipate the kingdom from Rome, and it was said at the time that his promotion to the Viceroyalty of Sicily was due

⁹ Greg. Vlad. Orlov, "Mémoires historiques—sur le Royaume de Naples." 1819, Vol. II, p. 166: "L'Antriche et l'Angleterre devinrent les seules puissances qui furent accueillies avec intérêt et considérées à la Cour de Naples; les agents de l'Espagne et de la France n'y éprouvaient que des refus et souvent des insultes."

¹⁰ A. von Arneth, "Joseph II. und Leopold von Toscana. Ihr Briefwechsel von 1781 bis 1790." Wien, 1872. Vol. I, p. 226. Joseph to the Queen of Naples, 10 Sept., 1784: "Le renvoi d'Acton sans raison serait un acte d'injustice et de faiblesse déshonorante pour le Roi à la face de toute l'Europe et dont je ne le crois pas capable, surtout n'ayant aucune raison d'avoir peur de son père."

¹¹ Rinaldi, *op. cit.*, p. 160. "Il Marchese de Marco era come invaso d'una vera mania furiosa contro Roma e contro le leggi ecclesiastiche . . . aver messo a capo della direzione dell'ecclesiastico un tal uomo, fù per la monarchia borbonica il fallo che arrecò le più funeste conseguenze; egli tra i ministri era il consigliere più ascoltato da Ferdinando."

Bourgoin, "Mémoires sur Pie VI," t. II, p. 73. (De Marco) formé à l'école de Tanucci, créature du Chevalier Acton, avait pour tout talent une avengle docilité aux volontés de ce ministre suprême, de la duplicité, et pour la Cour de Rome un grand fon et de malveillance qu'il prenait pour de la philosophie."

¹² Caracciolo told King George III. that the moon at Naples was brighter than the sun at London, and he used to say that he had found in England nothing polished but steel and no other ripe fruit than baked apples.

to the secret action of "les philosophes" whose influence extended over all Europe and had been brought to bear on the Queen of Naples.¹³

After delaying his departure from Paris for a year, Caracciolo landed in Sicily towards the end of 1781, and in accordance with the mania for sweeping away every trace of the past and reducing society to a dead level of equality under the absolute authority of the Crown, which was characteristic of the theoreticians of the philosophical school, he at once set about reforming the ancient institutions of the island, where, along with much that was defective, there existed a considerable amount of municipal and administrative independence.¹⁴ Some of his measures, such as the prohibition of burial in churches and the repression of the arbitrary and excessive authority of the nobles over their vassals, were, no doubt, advantageous to the country, but his contempt for the traditions and usages of the people as well as the sarcastic tone which he affected when treating of religious matters, irritated the Sicilians, a thoroughly Catholic people, and he left Palermo to return to Naples, followed by their hatred and their execrations.¹⁵

Although Caracciolo was nominally Prime Minister, he had but little authority in the management of affairs, for the influence of the Queen supported Acton, whose views agreed with hers, and she would have wished to add the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to those which he already held, but the King refused to place so much power in the hands of one man, and Caracciolo, aged and of an indolent disposition, was never anything but a tool in the hands of his more energetic and enterprising colleague.¹⁶

When Caracciolo entered upon his new functions no less than five out of twenty-one Archbishoprics and twenty-nine out of one hundred and ten Bishoprics were vacant in the Kingdom of Naples.¹⁷

¹³ Isidoro La Lumia, "Studu di Storia Sicilliana." Palermo, 1870. Vol. II., p. 555.

¹⁴ La Lumia, *op. cit.*, p. 556.

¹⁵ Tivaroni, "L'Italia prima della Rivoluzione Francese," p. 457.

¹⁶ Melfert, *op. cit.*, p. 308: "So wurde Caracciolo mehr zum Schein als erster Minister kingestellt während die eigentliche Seele des Cabinets Acton war." P. 362, Baron Thugut, the Austrian Ambassador at Naples, to Joseph II., 9 Dec., 1787: "La Reine me faisant l'honneur de me parler du Marquis Caracciolo et daignant me prévenir que la part qu'il avait à l'administration était absolument nulle, sa Majesté se laissa aller si dire qu'on ne l'avait mis à la place qu'il occupait, que parce qu'il n'avait pas été faisable d'ajouter d'abord ce département aux autres qu'on avait confés à M. Acton . . . Il est de fait que jouissant de toute la confiance de la Reine avec une sorte de certitude de faire adopter à sa Majesté toutes ses idées et la Reine étant à peu près sûre de pillar le Roi tôt out tard à toutes ses volontés, ce Ministre même dans ce moment-ci dispose à peu de chose presqu'arbitrairement de toutes les affaires de ce Royaume."

¹⁷ M. Schipa, "Un Ministro Napoletano del Secolo XVIII." Published in the "Archivis Storico delle provincia Napoletane," anno 21, p. 708.

There had been no Papal Nuncio since the death of Mgr. Vicentini, in 1779, and no communication with the Holy See could take place except by the authorization of some Crown official.¹⁸

The new Minister, who in spite of his reputation as a freethinker seems to have been less hostile to the Church than his predecessor and was more of a statesman, saw the necessity of reëstablishing better relations with the Sovereign Pontiff. He therefore readily listened to the suggestion of Mgr. Domenico Pignatelli, Bishop of Caserta, and informed the Abbate Servanzi, who had remained in Naples as secretary of the Nunciature, that he would be willing to come to an understanding with Rome, but at the same time did not conceal from him that the King was resolved to obtain the right of nominating to all the Bishoprics without exception.¹⁹

The proposal was immediately accepted by Pius VI., who in a letter to the Queen expressed his desire to come to an amicable agreement which should put an end to the misunderstandings and disputes which had so long existed between the two powers, and Mgr. Caleppi, an experienced diplomatist, who had been secretary to the Nuncios in Poland and in Austria, was sent to treat with the Minister at Naples, where he arrived on June 25, 1786. Lest, however, the Papal Government should be too hopeful of obtaining favorable terms, an edict drawn up by Caracciolo in the King's name was published a few days later, which asserted that the obedience of the religious orders to generals who resided outside the kingdom was an abuse which the King had lawful authority to reform, and that therefore the regular clergy of the two Sicilies should thenceforth be independent of their foreign generals and be subject, with regard to spiritual matters, to the Bishops of their respective dioceses. As, however, this decree had been signed by the King among other papers and published without his permission, he ordered its execution to be suspended on being appealed to by the Holy Father.

It would be impossible to give more than a very rapid sketch of the tedious negotiations which ensued and which lasted for nearly two years. Mgr. Caleppi had been instructed by Cardinal Buoncompagni, the Papal Secretary of State, to place great confidence in General Acton and be guided by his advice. But Acton was thoroughly devoted to the Queen and undertook nothing without her authorization.²⁰ He was, moreover, accused of wishing to prolong the negotiations as much as possible or even to break them off, as the revenues of the vacant sees and abbeys had been assigned to him for the purpose of augmenting the navy.²¹

¹⁸ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁹ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

²⁰ Rinieri, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

²¹ Schipa, *op. cit.*, p. 720.

Four subjects were to be treated by the representatives of the Holy See and of the Neapolitan Government—the right of nominating Bishops, the dependence of the religious orders on their superiors in Rome, the jurisdiction exercised by the Papal Nuncio and the collation of benefices and abbeys.²² From the beginning of the discussions Pius VI. showed himself willing to sacrifice many pecuniary advantages hitherto enjoyed by the Holy See, such as the contribution paid by the city of Naples to the Church of St. Peter, and the *spogli* or the property left by Bishops and Abbots at their deaths, which had always been claimed by the Papal Treasury. He was also willing, in the case of a vacant see, to allow the King to propose three candidates, from whom the Pope should select one, but the King refused to make any concession with regard to the Nuncio's jurisdiction and insisted on the right to name every prelate.

The Queen and the Marquis de Marco would seem to have been responsible for the obstinacy with which the King insisted on what he had been taught to look upon as the inalienable rights of the Crown, and though Caracciolo showed some inclination to conclude a Concordat which should be advantageous to the Church as well as to the State, his advice could not prevail against the influence of the Queen. Maria Carolina was guided in her resistance to Rome by the counsels and the example of her brothers, the Emperor of Austria and the Grand Duke of Tuscany. She was, moreover, glad to displease the Kings of France and of Spain, who were both anxious to see friendly relations established between Rome and Naples, and, as Mgr. Caleppi soon discovered, she supported the party which was opposed to any understanding with Rome and was the real obstacle to any concession.

Among the suggestions made on the Neapolitan side and apparently more with the hope of exhausting Mgr. Caleppi's patience than as a serious basis for a negotiation, was that of the formation of a *Giunta Ecclesiastica*, or Ecclesiastical Board, which should be empowered to hear appeals from the Bishops; to reform the rules of the monastic orders; to close religious houses; to dissolve marriages and grant dispensations within certain degrees of consanguinity. Neither this plan nor any of the many others put forward by Caracciolo were acceptable, while any concession which he made was speedily annulled by the King, who still maintained his original claims. At last Mgr. Caleppi left Naples for Rome in April, 1787, to ask for further instructions, and on his return he was again met with the same proposals, drawn up, it is true, in a slightly modified form, but the acceptance of which would have deprived the Holy See of all jurisdiction in the Kingdom of Naples, although Pius VI.

²² Rintieri, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

yielded both with regard to the *Giunta Ecclesiastica* and to the vacant Bishoprics, so far as to be willing to reserve to himself only the right of setting aside those nominees of the King's whom his conscience should oblige him to reject. The Holy Father also offered to share with the King and with the Bishops the right of collation to abbeys and benefices, but Ferdinand looked upon these very modest reservations as incompatible with his sovereign rights, and Caracciolo protested that the claims of the Papacy were opposed to the mode of thinking of the eighteenth century.

In spite of this evident ill-will and bad faith of the Neapolitan Government, Pius VI. still entertained so great a desire to establish friendly relations with Naples that when General Acton let it be understood that a visit from the Papal Secretary of State might facilitate the negotiations, Cardinal Buoncompagni left Rome for Naples without delay. His journey, however, was useless, as the King refused to allow the Holy Father even the right of rejecting the prelates of the *Giunta* whom he might consider unfit, and the Cardinal returned to Rome without having obtained any concession, while Caracciolo lamented his powerlessness in the matter, and Acton spread everywhere the report that the fault lay with Rome. He even accused Mgr. Caleppi of bad faith, on which the Pope immediately recalled his envoy, who brought his mission to a close in January, 1788.

The negotiations were, however, carried on by correspondence during the remainder of the year, as the Holy Father still entertained the hope of conquering the King's obstinacy; but he could not sanction the spoliation of the Church of which Ferdinand had been guilty by usurping the right of collation to no less than 758 benefices, in defiance of the laws of the Church, of the Concordat of 1741, of the protestations of the Bishops and of the last testaments of the founders of these pious works, which had been arbitrarily set aside. Nevertheless the Neapolitan Government soon flung off even the slight disguise of moderation it had hitherto shown in its dealings with the Holy See, for in September, 1788, the decree declaring the religious orders independent of all superiors residing abroad, which had been issued and then withdrawn in 1786, was definitively published, owing, it was said, to the influence of de Marco, and the regular clergy were also forbidden by the same decree to send representatives to congregations or chapters assembled in a foreign country, or even to hold a chapter within the kingdom without first obtaining permission from the King, who would then appoint a Bishop or some other dignitary as president.

The last act of discourtesy towards the Holy See for which the Marquis Caracciolo was responsible as Minister, though he most

probably acted in obedience to the will of Queen Maria Christina, was the refusal to perform the act of homage to the Sovereign Pontiff as feudal Suzerain of Naples, known as the presentation of *la chinea*, or white horse.

The origin of this ceremony is uncertain. It has been ascribed according to some to the fealty sworn by the victorious and repentant Normans to St. Leo IX. in 1053 after they had defeated his army and made him prisoner at Civitate in the province of Capitanata,²³ and by others to the investiture granted by Nicolas II. at Melfi in 1059 to Robert Guiscard of Apulia and Calabria, which he had already won from the Greek Emperor as well as of Sicily, from which he hoped to expel the Greeks and the Mahomedans.²⁴ The tribute of "12 denarii of the coinage of Pavia" for each yoke of oxen in the conquered territory which was then imposed was changed more than once by succeeding Popes and took its latest form in 1521, when Leo X., on conferring investiture of the two Sicilies on the Emperor Charles V.,²⁵ fixed it at 7,000 golden ducats and a white horse, to be presented every year on the vigil of the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul.

It was usually the head of the House of Colonna, the High Constable of the Kingdom of Naples, who represented the King on the occasion of this ceremony, when the white horse, covered with splendid trappings and carrying a silver casket containing the tribute, was led in state, escorted by the Swiss Guard and saluted by the guns of the Castle of St. Angelo, from the Palazzo Colonna to the doors of the Basilica of St. Peter's, where it was presented to the Holy Father, while the Prince pronounced the formal declaration of fealty.

A dispute between the servants of the Governor of Rome, those of the Spanish Ambassador and those of Prince Colonna, which arose during the procession of the white horse in 1776 with regard to a question of precedence, served Tanucci as a pretext for advising King Ferdinand to refuse to perform again this public act of homage, and for the future to present the 7,000 ducats privately and merely as a proof of his devotion to the Holy Apostles. Tanucci fell from power shortly afterwards, to be succeeded by della Sambuca, and at the request of the Pope the King of Spain persuaded his son to yield; the procession of the *chinea* therefore continued to take place with the usual pomp until the year 1788, when, under the Ministry of Caracciolo, acting most probably at the bidding of Maria Carolina, it

²³ Moroni, "Dizionario Ecclesiastico-Istorico," Vol. XXXVIII, p. 31.

²⁴ Abbé Odon Delars, "Les Normands en Italie," Paris, 1883, p. 323.

²⁵ Card. Stefano Borgia, "Breve Istoria del dominio della Sede Apostolica nelle Duc Sicilie," p. 228.

was decided that though the 7,000 ducats should still be paid as an offering to St. Peter, the presentation of the *chinea* and the acknowledgment of vassalage to the Sovereign Pontiff should cease. The ducats were duly offered by the Neapolitan Ambassador, but were declined by the Pope, who protested solemnly in St. Peter's against the refusal of the King of Naples to perform his obligations, stating that in his anxiety to restore peace to the Church he had made concession after concession till only two questions remained to be settled, but that the Neapolitan Government had broken off the negotiations and refused even to answer his letters; and this protest was renewed every year during the reign of Pius VI.

In the month of September Mgr. Servanzi, the secretary of the Nunciature at Naples, who had been charged by the Holy Father to present two briefs to persons engaged in a matrimonial suit, and who had not demanded the Royal *Exequatur*, was expelled from the kingdom at forty-eight hours' notice, and indeed his presence was no longer required in a country which had ceased to have any bond of union with Rome and was not far from declaring itself as independent of the Holy See as England.

The expulsion of Mgr. Servanzi was followed by other acts of arbitrary intervention in matters of ecclesiastical discipline, for as the Holy Father refused to appoint prelates to fill the vacant sees, the Archbishops were ordered to place them under the control of the neighboring Bishops. Happily the great majority of the Neapolitan episcopacy resisted these innovations and spoke frankly on the subject to the King, who, it is but just to say, showed himself less hostile to the Church than his Ministers and respected them for their courage; but the spoliation of the religious houses still continued, with the object especially of providing funds for the army and navy, while pamphlets hostile to the Holy See and to religion were allowed to circulate freely throughout the kingdom. The state of disorder which prevailed everywhere at last alarmed Caracciolo, whose eyes were beginning to be opened by the events which were just then taking place in France to the practical results of the doctrines of his friends, the "Philosophers." He again begged of Cardinal Buoncompagni to help him to find some issue from the deadlock, and Pius VI. expressed his willingness to make still further concessions; but the Minister who in Naples had not shown himself to be as hostile to the Church as he professed to be when in Paris died suddenly on July 16, 1789, and was succeeded as Secretary for Foreign Affairs by Acton, who thus, at last, concentrated all power in his hands.

Caracciolo's death was soon followed by the resignation of Cardinal Buoncompagni, who was succeeded by Cardinal Zelada, and negotiations were reopened with Naples regarding the important

questions of spiritual jurisdiction which had been under discussion, leaving aside for another occasion the tribute and the *chineea*. There were points on which Pius VI. could not yield, such as the power of hearing appeals exercised by the Nuncio at Naples, and the right of rejecting among the Bishops named by the King, or the persons selected to form part of the *Giunta Ecclesiastica*, those whom he should consider to be unworthy of the dignity, but the King and his Ministers still refused to give way and insisted on what they called the inalienable rights of the Crown.

It was only after long and tedious discussions that a compromise was at last effected in April, 1791, when Ferdinand and Maria Carolina, returning from a visit to Vienna, passed a few days in Rome, at which time more than half the sees in the Kingdom of Naples were vacant. Pius VI. then consented, for that occasion only and while a new Concordat was being prepared, to allow the King to nominate to the vacant sees, reserving to himself the canonical institution, the expedition of the bulls and the consecration, and without renouncing the right of rejecting those candidates whom he should deem to be unworthy. The new Concordat was never drawn up, and Ferdinand, or rather, perhaps, his Ministers and the Queen, dishonestly sought to render permanent a purely temporary concession, in return for which they had yielded nothing. They sent, indeed, General Acton to negotiate at Castellone, a town on the Neapolitan frontier, with Cardinal Campanelli; but, though the Holy Father again made considerable sacrifices with regard to the payments made to Rome by certain benefices, and to which the King laid claim, he still demanded the maintenance of the appellate jurisdiction exercised by the Nuncio and the reëstablishment of the presentation of the *chineea*. The offers made by Pius VI. were, however, of no avail; they were met on the part of the King by an obstinate refusal to yield anything in return or even to allow the Pope to reserve to himself matrimonial causes or matters connected with the professions of members of monastic orders unless they had been remitted to him by the Crown. With regard to the *chineea* he gave, indeed, a vague assurance that he might satisfy the Pope's demands, but he refused to include it in the Concordat.

The negotiations were therefore broken off at the end of July, 1792, and the envoys separated without having come to any conclusion. But the Court of Naples had soon to face an enemy far more dangerous than the Holy See, against whose influence in the kingdom it thought necessary to take such precautions; for whilst it was engaged in crushing the liberty of the Church and plundering religious houses, it neglected to take note of the progress made by Freemasonry, which after the fall of Tanucci had spread rapidly among

all classes of society, and by its secret machinations was preparing the downfall of the monarchy.

Not only the House of Bourbon, but every Catholic ruler in Europe during the eighteenth century seemed anxious to establish in his dominions a national church independent of the Holy See, but subject to the absolute authority of the State and deprived as much as possible of all outward splendor and ceremonial. Nowhere was this mania for interfering in matters of ecclesiastical discipline carried out with such intolerance and pedantry as in Austria under the Emperor Joseph II. and in Tuscany under the Grand Duke Leopold I. The House of Lorraine, to which these princes belonged, had inherited Tuscany in 1737 on the death of Gaston, the last of the Medici, and in accordance with the terms of the treaty made in 1736 at the end of the war between France, Spain and Austria for the succession to the throne of Poland. It was then decided that Tuscany should be given to Francis Stephan, Duke of Lorraine, as compensation for his hereditary duchy, which was assigned to Stanislas Leczinsky, the unsuccessful candidate to the Polish Crown and the father-in-law of Louis XV. Francis had married in 1736 Maria Teresa, daughter of Charles VI., Emperor of Austria, whose death in 1740 was followed by the war for the succession of Austria. At its close in 1745 he was elected Emperor, and thenceforth Tuscany was governed by a Council of Regency until his death in 1765, when his second son, Peter Leopold (1747-1792), was installed as Grand Duke.

The Republic of Florence and its successors, the Medici, had generally entertained friendly relations with Rome, but with the accession of the family of Lorraine various restrictions were imposed on the liberty of the Church, in accordance with the tendency then prevailing in Europe to eliminate as much as possible the influence of religion over society and replace it by that of the State. With the arrival of Leopold a still greater impulse was given to this movement, for the new ruler in his childhood had been intended for the Church, and to the theological instruction which he then received, and which was strongly tintured with the Febronian opinions in favor at the Court of Vienna has been sometimes ascribed the passion which he showed for legislating in purely ecclesiastical matters lying outside the jurisdiction of the secular power. In other respects Leopold's administration of his small territory was distinguished by many useful reforms. A number of minor tribunals were suppressed and their powers centralized in a Supreme Court of Justice; legal procedure was simplified and the laws were rendered more humane by the abolition of torture and of the punishment of death; agriculture was relieved from many oppressive tolls and burdens; roads

were opened which facilitated the communications between the duchy and the neighboring States, and by the drainage of the Val di Chiana and of the Val di Nievole these once pestilential districts were rendered fertile and habitable.

Leopold was not, however, content with these useful reforms, but in accordance with the prevailing theory of the absolute supremacy of the Sovereign over the Church he undertook to regulate and reorganize her discipline and administration. Shortly after the beginning of his reign he decreed that the *Exequatur* and the permission of the "*Ministro del Regio diritto*," or Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, should be obtained before soliciting any dispensation from Rome. He suppressed the right of asylum for criminals possessed by churches and religious houses, not by coming to an understanding on the subject with the Holy See, but by carrying off suddenly all such persons found in them. In 1785 he forbade many processions and pilgrimages and suppressed all the confraternities, which to the number of 2,500 had existed for centuries in Tuscany, establishing in their stead a *Confraternita di Carità* for caring for the sick. The reception of nuns was also regulated; their profession, which was not to be accompanied by any solemnity, could not take place before the age of 20 (which was afterwards raised to 30), while for men the ages for the novitiate and the profession were fixed at 18 and 24, and their vows were only to be taken for a year, with the faculty of renewing them. In the same year the Grand Duke secularized many convents, changing them into *conservatorii*, or schools for girls, under the administration of the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, leaving the nuns free to follow the religious life in another house of their order or to enter a *conservatorio*, and as soon as these schools were opened the convents were forbidden to teach, even gratuitously.

The Grand Duke's ideas with regard to the discipline of the Church in his States were put forward in fifty-seven articles in a circular addressed in January, 1786, to the Archbishops and Bishops of Tuscany, with a request to express their opinions on them frankly and with the utmost liberty, and to discuss them in the biennial synods of their respective dioceses. This strange document, which had been first submitted to the approbation of Scipione Ricci, the Bishop of Pistoia and Prato, bears unmistakably the stamp of that Jansenistic spirit which, under the mask of an austere piety, though refusing all obedience to Rome, aimed at overthrowing the supremacy of the Holy See, and which is so evident in the dealings of the various Italian sovereigns with the Church during the eighteenth century.²⁶

²⁶ "Punti Ecclesiastici compilati e trasmessi da Sua Altezza Reale a tutti gli Arcivescovi e Vescovi della Toscana e loro respective risposte." In Firenze, 1787, per Gaetano Cambiagi, Stampatore Granducale.

Among these reforms which Leopold considered advisable for the good of the Church come first the revision and correction of the Breviary and the Missal and a suggestion that the prayers used in the administration of the sacraments should be said in Italian. He then advises the Bishops to claim the right of granting many dispensations which have always been reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff; he recommends the adopting of an identical course of theological studies in all seminaries and ecclesiastical academies, and that candidates for the priesthood should be obliged to study for a certain number of years before being promoted from one order to another. The Bishops were also asked to suppress all private oratories, at least in towns; not to allow the feast of a saint to be celebrated on a Sunday, and absolutely prohibit panegyrics or sermons in honor of the saints. Only one Mass ought to be said at a time; indeed, only one altar ought to be allowed in each church, over which there should be a crucifix or perhaps a painting representing the titular saint or the Blessed Virgin, and these images should never be concealed by a curtain, while all tablets or *ex-votos* in commemoration of miracles should be removed. Moreover, at the exposition of the Blessed Sacrament there ought not to be more than twenty-four lighted tapers on the altar nor fewer than sixteen, and twelve at most at any other feast. With a few exceptions all processions ought to be abolished; all novenas and the feasts of recently canonized saints suppressed; all relics carefully examined and their authenticity well established. The Grand Duke also describes in the most edifying manner the virtues which should distinguish the ideal parish priest; lays down rules for the prayers which he should read to the people before and after Mass, the instructions he should give them after the Gospel and even the tone of voice with which he ought to say Mass, at which, perhaps, all those present who understood Latin might be allowed to join in the responses. The Grand Duke's solicitude extended also to the monastic orders. He suggested the subjects of the sermons to be preached to the nuns, who were not to have more than one altar in their churches and no decorations or music. The monks, too, might celebrate the feasts of the saints of their order at the single altar allowed to remain in their churches, but without any pomp or music and never on holidays of obligation or during the hours of the parochial services.

It is needless to say that with the exception of the Bishop of Pistoia and of the Bishops of Colle and of Pienza, who professed nearly identical principles, the Archbishops and Bishops of Tuscany rejected very decidedly this attempt to reorganize the Church from a Jansenist point of view, and though the answers of some of these prelates seem, perhaps, too profuse in those expressions of humility

and submissiveness to the authority of the sovereign habitually employed at that epoch, particularly in Italy, it is easy to perceive beneath their courtly language the firm resolution to perform their duty and to resist at all costs the pretensions of the unauthorized legislator.

They point out to him, for instance, that from the earliest centuries churches were always richly decorated; that it has always been the custom in the Church to pronounce panegyrics in honor of the saints and to celebrate the memories of the martyrs on the anniversaries of their death; that it would be inadvisable to reëstablish the discipline of the primitive Church, and that usages generally adopted by the Church should not be denounced as abuses. They remind him that the Council of Trent had foreseen all the abuses which were likely to arise, and that every Bishop knew how to deal with them as well as the rules which he had to follow in the administration of his diocese. As to the works which the Grand Duke had recommended for distribution among the clergy, they had for the most part been condemned by the Holy See. The Bishops finally advise the Grand Duke to beware of the persons in whom he has placed his confidence with regard to ecclesiastical matters, and they warn him that the sole object of the writers who attack the supremacy of the Sovereign Pontiff is to shake off every religious and civil authority, making use of the power of the Kings to destroy the authority of the Popes and of the united forces of the people to overturn the throne.

The condemnation by the Bishops of his Jansenist programme must have deeply wounded the vanity of the Grand Duke, who thereupon resolved to convoke a national synod, but he first judged it prudent to lay before an assembly of Bishops the questions to be submitted to the synod, hoping perhaps that the arguments of the theologians whom he had selected as his representatives might appease the alarms of the more scrupulous and induce them to accept his spiritual authority.

In the interval the Bishop of Pistoia held his diocesan synod from the 18th to the 28th of September, 1786. Of the 234 persons who assisted at it, 171 of whom were parish priests, a large number had been invited from distant parts of Italy, especially from the University of Pavia, which sent three of its professors noted for their Jansenism—Pietro Tamburini, Giuseppe Zola and Martino Natali—and the first of these, who was noted for his hostility to the Jesuits, his servile deference to the absolutism of the Crown, his resistance to the authority of the Holy See, and who was proud of the number of censures he had incurred, pronounced the discourse with which the synod was opened. The nature of the decrees of this synod, in

which Bishop Ricci desired to express the opinions which he had held for many years, can be sufficiently indicated by the fact that after mature deliberation and when Ricci had refused to come to Rome to justify himself, Pius VI., by the bull *Auctorum Fidei*, published on August 30, 1794, condemned eighty-five of the propositions which they enunciated.

In answer to the Grand Duke's invitation the three Archbishops of Tuscany and fourteen Bishops met in the Pitti Palace on April 23, 1787, under the presidency of Count Antonio Serristori, who represented the sovereign, while two professors of canon law from the University of Pisa and four theologians were charged with the defense of his proposed reforms. The assembly held nineteen sessions; the *Punti Ecclesiastici* were again discussed and again rejected by the great majority of the prelates, and only the Bishops of Pistoia, of Colle and of Chiusi were found willing to approve of the Grand Duke's suggestions. Leopold then saw the uselessness of summoning a national council, which would only have condemned his projects still more emphatically, and on June 6 he dismissed the assembly.

The Grand Duke's mania for remodeling every civil or religious institution was not cured by his failure to make the *Punti Ecclesiastici* take the place of the discipline of the Church, but he no longer sought to obtain the approbation of the clergy. In 1788 Mgr. Ruffo, the Papal Nuncio in Florence, was deprived of his appellate jurisdiction, which was transferred to the three Archbishops, and was informed that thenceforth he should be placed on the same footing as the other envoys. The Bishops were required to submit to the government lists of the candidates for holy orders, and the candidates were obliged to solicit the *Exequatur* of the government before being ordained. All processions except that of Corpus Christi were prohibited; all celebration of feasts of saints except that of the patron saint of each locality was suppressed, and all ceremonial or display of wealth at interments was forbidden.

But Leopold's mania for reforming every civil and religious institution in his States was happily brought to an end before he was able to inflict any permanent injury upon religion in Tuscany, for by the death of his brother, the Emperor Joseph II., on February 20, 1790, he succeeded to the throne of Austria, and after placing Tuscany under a Council of Regency he left Florence for Vienna. Immediately after his departure the irritation of the people caused by the suppression of so many of the religious orders to which they were attached, and the prohibition of the ancient usages inherited from their forefathers, was manifested by seditious movements at Pistoia, whence Ricci had to fly, and at Leghorn, where the people,

in spite of the resistance of the government, reëstablished the confraternities which had been abolished and held the procession of their patron, which had been forbidden. In Florence, too, though the Council of Regency in reply to numerous petitions had authorized the Archbishops of Florence, Pisa and Siena to restore many of the feasts and religious ceremonies which had been suppressed, disturbances took place and houses were attacked and plundered. Leopold, who saw the artificial fabric which he had so laboriously constructed on the ruins of all that the people cherished and venerated already beginning to crumble away, was indignant at the rejection of the reforms which he had ordered the regents to maintain carefully. He sanctioned, however, these concessions, though forbidding the regents to make any others; but further modifications of his legislation took place under the reign of his son, Ferdinand III., whom he installed as Grand Duke in April, 1791. In the same year the Bishop of Pistoia and Prato resigned his see, and after the death of Leopold, in 1792, the greater part of the laws by which he had sought to regulate the discipline of the Church were either revoked or very much modified at a conference held between representatives of the government and the three Archbishops.²⁷

The reforms imposed on the Catholic Church in Austria by the Emperor Joseph II. were still more destructive and more violently carried out than those in Tuscany, inasmuch as he possessed a more impetuous temperament, greater obstinacy, and though at first he did not suspect it, was much influenced by the secret societies which had brought all Germany under their sway, the Freemasons and the Illuminati.

Freemasonry had been first introduced into the Austrian Empire by a Count Sporck, who had been initiated in Holland and who opened a lodge in his palace at Prague in 1726; but it was not until 1746 that a lodge was opened in Vienna which reckoned among its members the Duke Francis Stephen of Lorraine, who had married in 1736 Maria Teresa, the daughter of the Emperor Charles VI., but who had not as yet been elected Emperor of Germany. The Duke had been received into the society in Holland in 1731, and in the same year had been given the rank of Master Mason at Houghton Hall, in the County of Norfolk, and his influence was able to avert any hostile measures on the part of the government against his fellow masons, who made proselytes speedily and secretly in every province of the Empire and among all classes of society, even, strange to say, among the clergy, in spite of the repeated proclamations of the Empress.²⁸

²⁷ Reumont, II., p. 250.

²⁸ Alfred Ritter von Arneth, "Maria Teresa und Joseph II. Ihre Correspondenz." Wien, 1867. Vol. II., p. 99. Marie Terèsa & Joseph II., 24

With the death of Maria Teresa, the last years of whose life had been embittered by her knowledge of her son's irreligious tendencies and of the influence which the Freemasons exercised over him, Joseph II. was at last free to carry out his plans for the complete reorganization of the Empire according to the theories of the party which boasted of itself as the party of enlightenment, "*Aufklaerung*." He was, indeed, sincerely anxious to promote the welfare of his people, but it had to be done in his own way, and he was convinced that any resistance to his plans could only proceed from ignorance or ill-will, and should be suppressed by force. He had been noted from his childhood for his obstinate and impetuous character, and his education, directed mainly by a Hungarian nobleman, Count Batthyany, a harsh disciplinarian; by the Secretary of State, Bartenstein, the author of a tedious history of Austria in fifteen folio volumes, and by Karl Anton Martini, a lawyer belonging to the unpractical sentimental school of the French philosophers, had left him without any solid instruction or love of learning, any capacity for appreciating art or any respect for ancient institutions. To this must be added the pernicious effect of his study of the works of Voltaire, which excited the admiration of Frederic II., his stay in Paris in 1777, where he frequented the society of the leading philosophers and "Encyclopedistes," and the influence of the Freemasons who surrounded him, who flattered his vanity and made use of his absolute powers to carry out their designs.

The strategy followed in the campaign against the Church in Austria was on the same lines as that which had been carried out in the other countries where the Jansenists and the Freethinkers had united their forces to undermine the Church. The Emperor's decrees on religious matters which flowed from his pen in a ceaseless torrent during his whole reign contained the same prohibitions against the reception of any document from Rome without first obtaining the *Exequatur*; the same suggestions to the Bishops to render themselves independent of the Holy See; the same interdiction of any communication between the monastic orders and their generals residing in Rome or with any religious house situated outside the Empire, which had been already put in force elsewhere, but the reforms of Joseph II. were on a far greater scale than those of Ferdinand IV. or of Leopold; they entered into more details and were more ruthlessly carried out.

It was by the decree of 29th November, 1781, that the Emperor

Decembre, 1775: "Il y a un grand malheur qui existe entre nous, avec les meilleurs volontés nous ne nous entendons pas . . . Vous faites trop voir l'antipathie contre toutes les anciennes coutumes et tout le clergé, des principes trop libres en fait de morale et de conduite. Cela alarme à juste titre mon coeur sur votre délicate situation et me frémit pour l'avenir."

announced his intention of suppressing all the contemplative orders in his dominions, and Prince von Kaunitz and Baron von Heinke were charged with its execution. According to the plan which they drew up, each province was to organize a "*Klosteraufhebungs commission*," or board for the suppression of religious houses, and these were replaced in August, 1782, by a board named "*die Geistliche Hofcommission*" (Royal Board of Spiritual Affairs), with affiliated sub-commissions in the provinces. The members of the suppressed religious houses were allowed a small pension and could join the secular clergy or enter some convent of their order situated abroad, or one of the orders still tolerated in Austria. Their property was to form a "*Religionsfond*," or fund for religious purposes, which was to pay them their pensions and assist schools or charitable institutions.

The Emperor seems to have acted under the impression that he was inspired, for he informed Pius VI. that he heard a voice within him calling out loudly that it became him as legislator and protector of religion to act thus and not otherwise, and he probably intended that the confiscated property should have been employed in the service of the Church; but many of the monastic buildings were turned into barracks and much of their wealth served to endow military schools and foundling hospitals.

In the archives of some provinces may still be seen the ponderous infolios which contain a minute inventory of the landed and funded property, the sacred vessels, the libraries and the furniture belonging to each religious house, for everything was executed strictly in accordance with the rules laid down, which also prescribed that the commissioners named by the local governments for the visitation of each monastery should perform their duties with kindness and courtesy.²⁹ The buildings, the lands and the forests of the orders were appropriated by the State for its own use or sold; the precious objects, paintings, reliquaries were put up to auction and the proceeds, together with the funded property, deposited in the "*Religionsfond*." The sacred vessels were to be given to the Bishops of the diocese or to newly founded parishes. The most valuable books and manuscripts were to be sent to the Imperial library, the others were to be distributed among the schools and libraries of the province. The monks and nuns were allowed to remain for five months in their houses, during which time they were supported by the State; they might then return to their homes or enter one of the orders still tolerated. It may be remarked that the writer from whom these details are drawn, an ardent partisan of Joseph II. and

²⁹ Adam Wolf, "*Die Aufhebung der Klöster in Innerösterreich, 1782-1790*." Wien, 1871, pp. 22-56.

no friend of the monastic orders, states that at the time of their suppression the religious houses in general were in a flourishing condition, their discipline was excellent, and no scandal or misdeed is recorded against them in the official reports.⁸⁰

It may be that in Innerösterreich (Styria, Carinthia and Carniola), with which alone Herr Wolf's work is concerned, the commissioners were perfectly honest and their accounts correct, but as a general rule their vandalism was such that in a few years the treasures of art and learning which the industry and the piety of many generations had amassed in the monasteries were wasted and dispersed without any advantageous result for either the Church or the State. A few examples from the many which are given by Catholic writers must suffice.

Gottfried van Swiethen, the president of the Board of Education, ordered to be sold as unsuitable for the library of a university early fifteenth century editions and works looked upon by bibliographers as priceless rarities; for, as he said, they only served to make a parade of erudition; and when in 1784 three hundred packages of theological works were about to be sold as waste paper for four florins (two dollars), he ordered them to be mutilated by tearing out some of the pages, lest the clergy might purchase them.⁸¹ The fate of the library of the Carthusian Monastery founded at Gumming by Duke Albrecht II. in 1332 was not much better. Though some of the charters and manuscripts were deposited in the State archives, hundreds of cartloads of others were carried away and were seen no more.⁸² The rich tapestries and vestments embroidered by the Duchess Johanna, the wife of the founder, her wedding ring and that of her husband, as well as their costly wedding robes, also disappeared. The commissioners suggested to the Emperor that Duke Albrecht's rapier, sword, dagger and choir book ought to be placed in the Imperial treasury and library, but the Emperor ordered them to be sold by auction, and the rapier went for six florins, the dagger for two, the sword for seven and the choir book for fifty-seven.⁸³ The collection of ancient weapons, cuirasses and banners belonging to the same monastery was sold as old iron, and the rare arms and armor, dating from the time of the Crusades down to the wars with the Turks, which was in the Benedictine Abbey of Saint Lambrecht, in Styria, were sold to a smith as scrap iron for 450 florins.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁸¹ Dr. Albert Jäger, "Kaiser Joseph II. und Leopold II., Reform und Gegenreform (1780-1792)," Wien, 1867, p. 142.

⁸² Sebastian Brunner, "Die Mysterien der Aufklärung in Sesterreich (1770-1800)," Mainz, 1869, p. 296.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 294.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 328.

The treasures of many other religious houses were flung away with the same recklessness. In the Cistercian Abbey of Lilienfeld, built in 1202 by Duke Leopold VII., a leaden fountain of great artistic value, an admirable specimen of Gothic workmanship, was broken up and sold to a Jew. The great bell of the church shared the same fate, the sacred vessels disappeared from the sacristy and the rarest works from the library.

Ten chests of silver vessels belonging to the Benedictine Abbey of Kremsmünster, which had been founded in 777 by Thassilo II., Duke of Bavaria, were carried off by the local officials without the authorization of the Emperor, who when he heard of it ordered them to be restored, but they had already been melted down, and the abbey received only 40,000 florins as compensation for what was worth 200,000. The Provost of the Canons of St. Florian at Linz was not more successful, for when after his monastery had been despoiled of its chalices, remonstrances, statues, reliquaries and censers, he obtained by appealing to the Emperor that at least a portion of the stolen property should be restored, it was found that all had disappeared into the hands of the Jews.⁸⁵

Pius VI. was alarmed by this ruthless persecution of the monastic orders and by the claim put forward by Joseph II. as one of his sovereign rights to name the Bishops of Lombardy. He found that neither his own letters nor the remonstrances of the Nuncio produced any effect on the headstrong character of the Emperor, and he therefore formed the resolution to go to Vienna, hoping that in a personal interview he might be more successful and obtain some concessions. Cardinal Herzan, the Austrian envoy in Rome, and other members of the Sacred College tried in vain to dissuade the Holy Father from undertaking this journey, and Joseph II. warned him that no arguments would make him depart from the principles which he had adopted for the good of religion in his States.⁸⁶

The Holy Father, however, persisted; he left Rome on 17th February, 1782, accompanied only by a few prelates of his court, and on March 22 he was met by the Emperor a few miles from Vienna, where he was received with enthusiasm by the immense crowds which had assembled from every part of the Empire to greet him. He was lodged in the imperial palace, but every entrance was carefully watched to prevent him from holding any communication with the outer world, and the Austrian Bishops were forbidden to come to Vienna without the express permission of the Emperor.⁸⁷ The

⁸⁵ Brunner, *ibid.*, p. 335.

⁸⁶ Dr. Hans Schlitter, "Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien und sein Aufenthalt daselbst." Wien, 1892. Erste Hälfte, p. 4.

⁸⁷ Brunner, "Mysterien," p. 222.

suppression of religious houses, too, continued to be carried out both in Bohemia and in Lombardy, and to counteract the good impression which the presence of the Sovereign Pontiff might produce on the people of Vienna, a number of scurrilous pamphlets was allowed to be published, in which the Papal dignity and the supremacy of the Holy See were violently assailed. They failed, however, to produce the intended effect, for on every occasion when the Holy Father appeared in public he was received with manifestations of the utmost veneration.

During his stay in Vienna Pius VI. had several interviews with Joseph II., in which the questions on which they were at variance were discussed, and though the Imperial Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor, Prince von Kaunitz and Count von Cobenze (both of whom, if not Freemasons, were completely at the service of that party), were not present, they furnished in writing their opinions on the subjects which were treated and made every effort to restrain the Emperor from yielding on any point.³⁸ It was not, therefore, possible for the Pope, who sought to uphold the traditional rights of the Church, and the Emperor, who believed that everything that was not purely dogmatical was subject to his authority, to come to an understanding, and after a month's stay Pius VI. took his departure. He had only succeeded in obtaining the hope of some very trivial modifications of the oppressive edicts with regard to the publication of the bull *Unigenitus* against the Jansenists, the oath taken by the Bishops, the *Placitum Regium* or *Exequatur*, matrimonial dispensations and the permission for the provincials of religious orders to inform the generals of their nomination.³⁹ The Holy Father had also been allowed to receive a deputation of Hungarian Bishops, to whom on account of the painful situation in which they were placed he granted very extended powers of dispensation, for these prelates were not only dignitaries of the Church, but also powerful nobles exercising great influence over the Hungarian people, and the Emperor was obliged to treat them with more consideration than those of his Austrian dominions.⁴⁰

Pius VI. left Vienna on 22d of April, 1782, and the Emperor accompanied him for a few miles as far as the Augustinian Monastery of Maria-Brunn, where he took his leave of the Sovereign Pontiff and received his blessing, apparently with the utmost respect, but shortly

³⁸ Schiltter, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-69: "Aus ihr (die Antwort des Kaisers auf das Memorandum des Papstes) geht deutlich hervor wie sehr der Kaiser das Bestreben zeigte, sich dem Papste zu nähern, aber stets wider von Kauntz mit aller Entschiedenheit zurückgehalten wurde."

³⁹ Schiltter, *op. cit.*, pp. 59, 81, 84, 93.

⁴⁰ Dr. Albert Jäger, "Kaiser Joseph II. und Leopold II. Reform und Gegenreform (1780-1792)," Wien, 1867, p. 118.

afterwards the monastery was suppressed.⁴¹ This was followed by further measures against the Church. The suppression of the religious houses was executed with greater severity than previously. Three days after the departure of Pius VI. 160 were suppressed in the Netherlands, 64 in Bohemia, 31 in Upper and Lower Austria and in the following month of September all those of the mendicant orders shared the same fate.⁴² It was also forbidden to insert in future in any calendars, breviaries or prayer books any indulgences applicable to the souls in Purgatory, and that doctrine was also ordered to be omitted from all future editions of the catechism. The boundaries of several dioceses were then changed; any portion of a foreign diocese which extended into the territory of Austria was detached from it and added to the adjacent Austrian diocese without consulting either the Bishop or the Pope.

It would be impossible to enter more fully into the ecclesiastical reforms of a sovereign who during a reign of ten years issued no less than 6,206 edicts, a large number of which were directed against the Church, but one of the most important cannot be omitted—that of 30th March, 1783—which decreed the closure of all the diocesan and monastic seminaries in the Empire and instituted grand seminaries at Presburg for Hungary, at Vienna for Upper Austria, at Prague for Bohemia, at Olmutz for Silesia and Moravia, at Lemberg for Galicia, at Gratz for Syria and Corinthia, at Innsbruck for Tyrol, at Freiburg for Breisgau and at Pavia for Lombardy,⁴³ to which the Bishops were ordered to send their students. The Emperor's intention was that they should all follow the same course of studies, calculated to form obedient and well drilled functionaries of the State, but completely divested of all trace of Catholicity, for according to the programme of these institutions published at Vienna in 1784, their principal object was to be the abolition of ultramontan-ism.⁴⁴ The teaching of ecclesiastical history, of Biblical exegesis, of moral and pastoral theology, of canon law and of patrology were to be based on philosophical principles—that is to say, on the theories of the "Encyclopedistes,"⁴⁵ and their libraries were furnished with Jansenist and Protestant works, especially with those which showed tendencies towards rationalism.⁴⁶ As professors both in these semi-

⁴¹ Schlitter, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

⁴² Jäger, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

⁴³ Rev. Augustine Theiner, "Jean Henri Conte de Frankenberg, Cardinal Archevêque de Malines, Primat de Belgique, et sa lutte pour la liberté de l'Église et pour les séminaires épiscopaux sous l'Empereur Joseph II. Traduct par Paul de Gealln, missionnaire Apostolique," p. 32.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁴⁵ Jäger, p. 129.

⁴⁶ Theiner, *ibid.*, p. 85.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

naries and the recently established normal schools, care had been taken to select men who 'whether priest or laymen, had neither conscience nor faith, neither religion nor morals, and for whom naught was sacred."⁴⁷

It is sad to say that, with few exceptions, the Austrian Bishops submitted to this decree,⁴⁸ but when on March 15, 1786, the Emperor informed the Belgian prelates that he intended to extend the same measure to Belgium and unite all their students in a general seminary at Louvain, he met with more resistance. Cardinal von Frankenberg, the primate of Belgium, protested strongly and implored the Emperor to abandon his project, but in vain. On October 16 an edict suppressed the diocesan seminaries as well as all schools of philosophy or theology in monasteries. November 1 was named as the opening day both of the Seminary of Louvain and of that of Luxemburg for the province of that name,⁴⁹ and the students were warned that unless they followed a course of five years at one of these establishments they should not be raised to the priesthood.

The management of religious affairs in Belgium had been entrusted to an ecclesiastical commission composed of men known as Jansenists and declared enemies of the Church, and the rector of the seminary, the Abbé Stöger, who had been professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Vienna, had written a manual of history, the irreligious tone of which has caused him to be expelled by order of the Empress Maria Teresa.⁵⁰ Still the Bishops, who found their protestations of no avail, who also probably feared that the government might employ force and who were somewhat tranquillized by Count Belgiojoso, the Chief Secretary at Brussels, who assured them that the Emperor would not allow any error to be taught in the seminary, and that their observations on the subject would be attentively listened to, allowed very reluctantly their students to proceed to Louvain. The theological lectures began on December 1, but before long the impiety displayed by Stöger and the other professors in their teaching and their uncouth manners drove the students to open revolt. They broke the windows of the class room and forced Stöger to take flight, and lest the people should take arms in their defense, troops were sent from the neighboring towns, when several of the seminarists were arrested and imprisoned.⁵¹

As the students still refused to assist at theological lectures where Jansenist opinions were openly professed, further arrests were made, but to no purpose, for one after another they fled from the seminary

⁴⁸ Thelner, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

till at the end of January, 1789, only twenty remained out of 300 who had been present. The Bishops were immediately ordered by the ecclesiastical commission to refuse to assist or to shelter the fugitives under pain of being treated as their accomplices, and to send them back to the seminary without delay. The Papal Nuncio at Brussels, Mgr. Zondadari, who was accused of having circulated in Belgium the Papal bull *Super Soliditate* in condemnation of Eybel, was expelled from the country, and Cardinal von Frankenberg, unjustly denounced as being the cause of the revolt at Louvain as well as of the irritation prevailing among the people against the imperial decrees, was summoned to Vienna. The Cardinal fully enlightened the Emperor with regard to the civil and religious situation, but as was the case with Pius VI., his words were of little use.

The Belgian people, however, were less submissive than the Austrian subjects of Joseph II. and much more ardently attached to their religion and to their ancient institutions. They also enjoyed privileges and liberties possessed at that time by no other nation on the Continent of Europe. The ten provinces into which Belgium was divided were independent of each other, though subject to the representative of the ruling power, who resided in Brussels, but in their various changes from the sovereignty of the Dukes of Burgundy to that of the Kings of Spain and lastly to the House of Austria, they had always preserved their traditional constitutions, built up slowly in the course of centuries by the charters granted at various epochs by their princes. The province of Brabant alone possessed a charter, in which all the chief privileges of the land were clearly and definitely expressed. It was known as the "*Laetus ingressus*," or Joyous Entry,⁵² as every sovereign on ascending the throne was obliged to swear that he would govern in conformity with its articles, the most important of which was that if the sovereign were to infringe any one of the stipulated rights his subjects might refuse to obey him until he had withdrawn the obnoxious measure.⁵³

Joseph II. in the beginning of his reign was inaugurated in the different provinces of Belgium. His sister, the Archduchess Maria Christina, and her husband, Duke Albert, of Saxe-Teschen, the governors general, swore in his name in each of the chief cities to maintain intact the ancient rights and privileges both of the Church and of the province.⁵⁴ What must then have been the indignation of the Belgian people when by a succession of edicts in November, 1786; January, March and April, 1787, Joseph II. swept away the historic institutions of their country to replace them by a new division of the

⁵² Thelner, *ibid.*, p. 41.

⁵³ Rev. L. Delplace, S. J., "Joseph II. et la Révolution Brabançonne," Bruges, 1891, p. 25.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

territory administered by a new order of functionaries, who were to make known the imperial commands and be obeyed even if they should appear to exceed the limits of their authority.⁵⁵

This despotic measure speedily brought matters to a crisis, and the States of Brabant, relying on the privileges guaranteed by the "Joyous Entry," refused to vote the taxes (19th April, 1787).⁵⁶ Protestations and petitions flowed in from all sides to the States, to the governors general and to the Emperor, and some slight concessions were made by the suspension for a time of the new courts of law. Thirty-one deputies were then elected by the provinces to lay their demands before the Emperor at Vienna, but they found him obstinately resolved to carry out his measures, though he promised that if they first of all submitted he would go to Belgium to try to come to an understanding with the States.⁵⁷

Again the States of Brabant refused to vote the taxes until on September 21 General Murray, who had replaced the Archduchess and her husband as governor general, acknowledged the ancient privilege and consented to suppress the new courts of law and the new officials. The Emperor, however, changed his mind again. General Murray was replaced by Count von Trauttmansdorf on October 25, 1787, and Count d'Alton was put in command of the army. Another attempt was then made to reopen the general seminary at Louvain, in spite of the strongest protestations on the part of the Bishops and of the States, but its halls remained empty; and as the diocesan seminaries had again received their students, the government resolved to suppress them by force, but the people in many places rose in their defense, and at Malines and Antwerp the disturbance was only suppressed after much shedding of blood (August, 1788).

But the end was close at hand. In January, 1789, the Emperor withdrew whatever concessions he had made; the States of Brabant and Hainaut were forbidden to meet again; in February the Bishops and the superiors of the religious orders received positive commands to send their students to the general seminary under pain of confiscation of their revenues, and in many cases the students were forcibly carried off and transported to Louvain.⁵⁸

A general agitation then began to spread throughout all Belgium. Under the leadership of Henri van der Noot, an advocate of the Sovereign Council of Brabant, and of Colonel Van der Mersch a large body of volunteers was formed on the Dutch frontier and many villages prepared to take up arms in spite of the threats of Count d'Alton

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁵⁶ Delplace, *ibid.*, p. 92.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁵⁸ Theiner, p. 220.

that he would lay in ashes any town which revolted. Trauttmansdorf, foreseeing the coming revolution, promised in the Emperor's name to recall the obnoxious reforms, but the Belgian nation, which had been already deceived, rejected his overtures, and on October 26, 1789, Van der Mersch entered Belgium with a few thousand men. The defeat of the Austrian troops at Turnhout was the signal for a general insurrection. The garrison of Ghent surrendered; Brussels, Malines, Antwerp, Namur and Louvain were evacuated, and by the end of December the country, with the exception of Luxemburg and the citadel of Antwerp, was freed from the rule of Joseph II.⁵⁹

Overwhelmed by this unexpected disaster and with his eyes at last opened by the results of his anti-religious reforms, the Emperor turned for help to the Sovereign Pontiff, whom he had so often defied and insulted, and promised to repair as much as in him lay the injury he had inflicted on the Church and on the liberties of the Belgian people. At his request Pius VI. wrote, on January 13, 1790, to Cardinal Frankenberg and to the Bishops of Belgium to inform them of the Emperor's resolution and to exhort them to persuade their fellow-countrymen to return to their allegiance, since they had at last obtained what they sought. But it was too late. Deputies from all the provinces except Luxemburg had already assembled in Brussels under the presidency of Cardinal Frankenberg, and on January 11 they proclaimed a confederacy bearing the name of "*les Etats-belgiques-unis*."

Joseph II. died on February 20. On January 28 he had just previously revoked by a decree the greater part of the reforms which he had tried to impose on the Hungarians and which had nearly driven them also to revolt. The day before his death he said to the Prince de Ligne, a Belgian nobleman and an intimate friend: "Your country has killed me; the taking of Ghent has been my agony; the loss of Brussels my deathblow. How humiliating for me; how humiliating!" And he asked to have inscribed on his tomb as epitaph: "Here lies a Prince whose intentions were pure, but who had the misfortune to see all his projects fail."⁶⁰

With the accession of Joseph's brother, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, a reaction took place. The new sovereign had the sense to revoke much of the ecclesiastical legislation of his predecessor; the general seminaries were abolished; the Bishops were no longer interfered with in the management of their dioceses; some of the religious houses which had been suppressed were reopened and their property restored, but the *Exequatur* for Papal bulls and briefs was still main-

⁵⁹ Delplace, *ibid.*, p. 120.

⁶⁰ Dr. Albert Jäger, "Kaiser Joseph II. und Leopold II. Reform und Gegenreform, 1780-1792," p. 297.

tained and the confraternities and processions still prohibited. Overtures were then made to the Belgians. Leopold disapproved frankly of the innovations imposed by his predecessor and promised to acknowledge the ancient right and institutions of Belgium. He was aided in the attempt to reestablish his authority by the dissensions which arose among the deputies, some of whom were willing to submit, while others wished to introduce the revolutionary ideas of the French Jacobins.⁶¹

France and England when applied to by the States General refused to intervene in their defense, and on December 3, 1790, the Austrian troops reentered Brussels. The Emperor adhered faithfully to his promises; he gave back to the Church the rights of which she had been deprived by the edicts of Joseph II., and he granted a general amnesty, but peace had hardly been restored when he died suddenly on March 1, 1792, shortly after having concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with Prussia against France, the Legislative Assembly of which was threatening to invade the German electorates and to let loose those armies of the Revolution which were to deluge all Europe with blood.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

THE SANCTUARY LITERATURE OF MEDIÆVAL ENGLAND.

THE study of pre-Reformation religious life in England has been coming to the fore by leaps and bounds. The "Continuity" theory is doubtless responsible in great measure for the movement; for the busy and venturesome vanguard of advanced Anglicanism is appropriating with the most delightful daring the erstwhile discarded treasures—both doctrinal and liturgical—of a Church it was once taught to hate and disown. Impervious to anything that savors of logic and historical consistency, the High Anglican recounts without a blush the sources from which his much-lauded Prayer Book was taken. It no longer comes upon him as a revelation or an untoward circumstance that whatever beauty it may possess was flagrantly borrowed from a Church which "hath erred in matters of faith;" on the contrary, he feels quite at home in a pre-Reformation library of even "Mass" books, and talks

⁶¹ Théodore Juste, "Histoire de Belgique." Bruscelles, 1868. Vol. III, p. 83. London, England.