Leibniz (1646–1716) : almost equally distinguished as Mathematician + man of affairs born at Leipzig where his father was Professor of Moral Philosophy (not published until 1819) 1686, Leibniz : Systema Theologicum – an attempt to reconcile Roman Protestant : + his celebrated correspondence with Bossuet, which puts Leibniz at heart in the same i.e. of a true Reformed Catholic (Essays of Duchess of Orleans)

WORKS BY SAME AUTHOR

HOLY TRINITY PARISH CHURCH, HULL

THE STORY OF PSYCHOLOGY
[Story of the Sciences Series]

A SHORT PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION

THE REUNION OF THE CHURCHES

A STUDY OF G. W. LEIBNITZ AND HIS GREAT ATTEMPT

BY

G. J. JORDAN

DOCTOR OF DIVINITY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM
DOCTOR OF LETTERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

CONSTABLE & CO LTD
LONDON
1927

DEDICATED TO HIS GRACE

COSMO GORDON (Lang)

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

CHAIRMAN OF THE LAMBETH COMMITTEE

ON REUNION

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

PREFACE

THIS work is written as a contribution to the growing body of thought on the Reunion of the Churches, which will focus itself at the Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, August 3–21, 1927. No group of Christians can discuss the Reunion of the Churches without a record of the correspondence of Leibnitz and Bossuet at their side; for, in that correspondence of more than twenty years, Catholic and Protestant spoke to each other in the person of the greatest theological giants since the Reformation. Moreover no single mind has been so completely devoted to Reunion or so well informed about the Churches as that of Leibnitz. He is the precursor of such men as Silas McBee and Sir Henry Lunn, themselves also laymen. But, unlike them, he was nearer the source of our Church divisions and had access to knowledge which only the generation immediately succeeding the Reformation could possess. Throughout the annals of the Church there is no more instructive personality for our times, in which the fissiparous movement within the Churches has ceased and when Reunion is sought in that new form of Œcumenical Conference of which Stockholm and Lausanne are destined to be the outstanding examples of this century.

The interesting fact about the period covered by this book is that the Churches felt, for the first time, the burning need of Reunion. The Reformation was nearly a century behind them. The Protestant Churches had taken their places side by side with the Roman Church in the life of Europe. But religious adjustments proved difficult. Religious passion set fire to political differences and blazed forth in the tragedy of the Thirty Years' War. Theologians and laymen were staggered by the results of confessional hatreds. They were determined to prevent another tragedy like it. They would work for the Reunion of the Churches. Among them G. W. Leibnitz, the greatest layman of his day, was the most interesting figure. His efforts after Reunion, covering over half a century, cannot be equalled in the whole history of religious irenics.

Leibnitz is known to English readers as a philosopher and a mathematician, as the champion of the pre-established harmony and as the co-inventor, with our celebrated Newton, of the Differential Calculus; but there is nothing

in English on the work which was dearest to his heart—his efforts for the Reunion of the Churches.

The sources for such a study are difficult to obtain. I was considerably helped by the favourable exchange during 1920 and was able to get Guhrauer, Pichler, Rommel from Leipzig, the native city of Leibnitz; Dr. Williams' library supplied me with occasional sources like Russell, Hagenbach, etc.; and to my great joy I found a complete copy of Foucher in Paris.

CONTENTS

THE REUNION OF THE CHURCHES

CHAPTER I

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY DURING THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

"Quoties periculosum rerum statum et torporem nostrum præsentem perversaque consilia considero, toties pudet me nostri in conspectu posteritatis. Manifestissimum est, in eo rem esse, ut omnia in Europa susque deque vertantur, et tamen perinde agitur, ac si omnia tuta essent, Deumque haberemus fidejussorem tranquillitatis nostræ. Interea de minutis litigamus, magnorum incuriosi. Ea res facit, ut propemodum tædeat præsentis temporis historiam cogitare. Usque adeo Germani nostris actibus sinistra aliorum judicia confirmamus.—LEIBNITZ to his friend Ludolf, 12 Dec., 1698: Feller-Otium, Han., 1718, p. 121.

THE Church in Germany during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries must be considered as a whole. The Reformation Period does not end with the death of Luther or of Calvin, but exerts a direct and potent influence at least as far down the seventeenth century as the Peace of Westphalia. The Reformers were prophets. They saw little more than the destructive side of their work. It was only later that their constructive influence on politics and society began to take shape. The statesman followed the prophet. The principles of the Reformation had to submit to the test of more prosaic times. The tremendous ordeal to which they were put during the seventeenth century was in reality the settlement of the question as to whether they were to have a permanent place in Christendom at all. When the Reformers died and when the early enthusiasm of a new movement had passed away, there was at least one moment in the Thirty Years' War when the life of Protestantism seemed to be in jeopardy. However deep therefore our interest may be in the Church

of the sixteenth century it should not be forgotten that the Reformation was not established until the Peace of Westphalia. Until then the decision lay in the balance.

The influence of the Reformation on the life of Germany was without the controlling power of a strong government. Religious passion was without constraint. Nonconformity in England had no opportunity of becoming militant in England as long as Elizabeth was on the throne; but in Germany Lutheranism and Calvinism advanced almost unchecked without any external power to moderate their bitter religious animosities between each other or against the Roman Church. The Emperor was powerless to prevent this insidious development. Ever since the election of Rudolph of Hapsburg in 1273 the voice of the Emperor had become more and more silent in matters of national concern. By the 39 Articles of the Golden Bull or the Edict of Charles IV at the Diet of Nuremberg, 1356, the important archbishops of Mainz, Cologne and Treves were definitely recognised as Electors of the Empire. Along with them were the King of Bohemia, the Count Palatine, the Duke of Saxony and the Margrave of Brandenburg. Together they formed the Electoral College. It was an extremely powerful body of men from a territorial point of view, but national interests were often abused by selfish and private interests within it. The Second House of Princes consisted of all the heads of the independent governments whether religious, as the bishops, abbots and heads of monasteries, or secular, as the dukes, counts, margraves and burgraves. The Third House, or the representatives of the Free Cities, had a cause to fight often in opposition to that of the other two estates. In the Diet the three Houses deliberated separately, but were bound to concur with one another and with the Emperor before action could be taken. The Third House had been known to negative the other two; and when it is remembered that the Emperor often found himself uniting with the Princes against the towns or with the towns against the Princes, according to their respective aims, it is easy to see how impossible it was to enforce a strong national policy.

In spite of the weakness of the Central Government it would be difficult to account for the sudden success of Protestantism without recognition of the intensive prepara-

tion for it in the heart of Germany itself. Ninety per cent. of the population became Protestant within fifty years. Just as historians have forgotten to take the Reformation Period in Germany down to 1648, so they have not always looked far enough back into peculiarly German thought for its deep origin. It was at the Court of Louis of Bavaria that the liberal views of Marsiglio of Padua (1324) and of William of Ockham (1327) were made the grounds of an attack upon the power of Pope John XXII. Germany must have been thrilled with theories on which an attempt was made to regain Italy for the Empire. The Emperor set up a form of government in Italy after his own heart. The Pope threatened the "officers of State in Italy with excommunication if they did not resign their dignities and offices, and announced that the oath of fealty taken by their subjects was not binding." The Emperor became master of Rome for a short time; an antipope was chosen and Marsiglio was named Papal Vicar in the city. Although Louis had returned to Germany in 1330 and was a suppliant at the Pope's feet in 1336, Germany must have been profoundly moved by the thoughts of the "Defensor Pacis" and of the "Dialogus" and by the exhibition of a practical though ephemeral attack on the Papacy. Nor should we forget that some of the chief writers during the Conciliar Period were Germans. Henry of Langenstein, "named of Hesse, by nation a German" (dictus de Hassia natione Teutonicus), introduced the chief ideas of the movement. Gerson himself acknowledges his debt to Langenstein. "About which time," *i.e.* early in the schism, he writes, "Henry of Hesse Master in Theology and of radiant memory wrote on behalf of the same conclusion," *i.e.* of the way of a General Council, which Gerson was trying to popularise. If Theodoric of Niem, the German secretary of the Papal Curia, is the author of *De Modis Uniendi ac Reformandi Ecclesiam* (1410), a work with many parallels to Luther's *To the Christian Nobility*, we can well understand the prepared nature of the soil in which the Reformers did their sowing. What an influence must ideas like the following have exercised over those who read them.

"In all things we must be obedient to the Emperor" (*Defensor Pacis*, Goldast, II. 4, 197).

"Pilate had coercive jurisdiction over Christ. The

Emperor is judge of the High Pontiff" (*Dial.*, Goldast, VI. 4, 511).

"You know well that the Catholic Universal Church is the name given to the union of different members who form one Body, of Greeks, Latins and Barbarians who believe in Christ, of men and women, peasants and nobility, of poor and rich; of which Body . . . Christ is the only Head. Others like the Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, Clergy, Kings, Princes and People are members arranged in various ranks."

"In this Church and in its Faith all men may be saved, even if no Pope may be found in all the world" (*De Modis*, von der Hardt, I. 68 ff.).

With Protestantism so deeply set in the mind of Germany, it was obvious that the religious problem of the Post-Reformation was to find the terms on which two great religious parties—Protestants and Roman Catholics—could exist side by side. At first severe experience was to teach both parties that the idea of conquest of one by the other was impossible. The lesson was learned after nearly a hundred years of tortuous intrigue and ingenious attempts to upset the balance one way or the other. The balance of parties during that period is of the utmost importance.

At the commencement of the struggle the situation was curious. In the Diet "Three Ecclesiastical Electors were met by the votes of three lay electors. But in the House of Princes there were thirty-eight Ecclesiastical dignities and but eighteen laymen—to pass measures favourable to Protestantism through such a House was simply impossible."[1] The result was that the Emperor and the majority of the Princes were in opposition to the majority of the nation and the minority of the Princes. In other words, there was an awkward tension between rulers and people; and there could be nothing expected but scheming diplomacy and futile make-believe.

The Peace of Augsburg (1555) is an outstanding instance of this. Charles V showed himself conscious of the situation. Although the Diet was with him in his attack on Protestantism, he knew that it was politically unwise to try

[1] Gardiner, p. 3. The Elector of Saxony, the Duke of Luneburg, the Prince of Anhalt, the Landgrave of Hessen-Cassel, the Margrave of Brandenburg were on the Protestant side along with the Free Cities.

to extinguish the Reformation in face of the mass of the nation. He consented to a compromise.

To all appearances the terms of the Peace acknowledge the Principle of Parity between the two religions. In reality it was parity based on politics. "The whole agreement was after all but a concession to necessity which a decisive change in the balance of power in the Empire might at any time overthrow." [1] Moreover no thought was taken for the Calvinists, who were rapidly advancing into Germany along the whole line from Switzerland to the Low Countries. The idea of Toleration was therefore strictly limited. And freedom of religious choice was not only limited to Lutherans and Catholics, it was further restricted to the circle of the rulers and princes themselves. The people had no voice. "Cuius Regio eius Religio" meant something harder and more limited at Augsburg than it did later at Westphalia.

The scandal of the "Reservatum Ecclesiasticum," by which a Catholic prelate was obliged to relinquish his office on conversion to the Protestant Faith, was not calculated to mitigate Protestant feeling and was never accepted by Protestants as a whole. It meant that a stop was put to further conversions to Protestantism, and was sufficient to keep many princes who were wavering at that time within the Catholic fold. The glaring instance of Gebhard, Archbishop of Cologne, was enough to terrify any enthusiast for Protestantism. In 1590 he passed over from Rome to Protestantism, but was driven from office for doing so. The strange result was that Cologne became the great Catholic stronghold of Germany. "Such examples may suffice to show how small was the possibility of a lasting peace." [2]

Again, the article of the Peace referring to the secularisation of Church Property before and after 1552 could not be kept. The impact of Protestantism was at that moment so great that eight bishoprics had become Protestant since 1552 and ought to have been handed over to Catholic rulers by the terms of the Peace. They were possessed, however, by Protestant rulers who refused to move.

The whole Peace was out of date almost as soon as it was framed. The religious environment was in flux. No party was satisfied, and the quarrel was postponed until the two parties were consolidated. "Solidly as these men

[1] *Cambridge Modern History*, III., 140. [2] Hagenbach, p. 6.

tried to rear their edifice, ponderous as were the claims by which they strove to bind posterity, the result was merely a series of fainthearted half-measures by which indeed the final war of the two religions was to be staved off for sixty years; but which in the end were to bring upon Germany a scourge and a visitation longer and more deadly than has been suffered by any other nation of modern times."[1]

From the Peace of Augsburg to the opening of the Thirty Years' War (1618) the balance turned more and more in favour of Catholicism. First came the disillusionment about Protestantism. Even in the very early days there were some discomforting facts. Men abused the great spiritual idea of the inwardness and individuality of vital religion. It is not from witnesses who were reconverted to Catholicism after experiencing the disillusionment of their conversion that we need seek the evidence. Converted and convinced Lutherans like Johann Eberlin of Gunzburg testify to the perils of Protestantism.[2] He says that he would rather preach in a town that was still Papist than in one in which the people had turned their freedom into licence. "But we shall have to answer for all this recklessness," he adds, "of that there is no doubt." Curicius Cordus, a Lutheran lecturer in the University of Erfurt, says in a letter, 1523: "Our school is going to ruin, and among the students there is an amount of licentiousness which would not be exceeded in a camp of soldiers." Rudolph Walther gives an account of the Protestant University of Marburg (August 1540) thirteen years after its foundation by the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. "The state of morality here," he says "is such as Bacchus and Venus would have prescribed to their followers. To get drunk and spew and stagger about the streets brings shame to nobody; it is thought to be rather a fine thing and a good joke. But why should not the students behave in this way seeing that most of the professors do the same?" Obedience, reverence, honesty, simplicity, and genuine repentance were often lacking; churchgoing began to decline, and there can be no wonder that men like Georg Witzel, Johann Haner, Crotus Rubeanus, Thobold Villikanus, Wilibald Pirkheimer, who had come into close contact with this lower side of Protestantism, went back to the Roman Church thoroughly disillusioned.

[1] Henderson, L., pp. 391, 392. [2] Plummer, p. 180 ff.

There was also the growing bitterness of Protestants among themselves. The religious hatred between Lutherans and Calvinists seems to have been caused primarily by the Calvinistic and novel view of the Holy Communion. The Lutherans with their Doctrine of Consubstantiation were shocked by the irregular view imported from Geneva. The Calvinists were impolitic in their attitude to the Empire. They spoke of it in such a way as to offend both Lutherans and Catholics; and it cannot be wondered at when they suffered under the smart of their exclusion from the circle of Toleration drawn by the Peace of Augsburg. Amidst the difficulties of the hatred between Protestants and Catholics just before the Thirty Years' War, therefore, came the further and more subtle animosity between Lutherans and Calvinists. "To all these dilemmas," writes the historian of the times just before the Great War, "was added the continuous division of Protestants among themselves. Lutherans and Calvinists hated each other at least as much as Protestant and Catholic." People said that fire and water would mix before Lutherans and Calvinists. "Where the Reformed (Calvinists) were persecuted, there pity and sympathy were missing on the part of the Lutherans. This had already been shown in the Huguenot War and in the rising of the Netherlands. Indeed, in these bitter religious wars the harsh Lutherans of those days saw nothing but wars of mutiny of fanatical subjects against their rightful rulers, to be punished as such." [1]

But there was also the petty parochial nature of Court Protestantism, as it had developed before the arrival of Calvinism, to reckon with. It was a great thing for German education that each prince had a system of education culminating in the university, but it was a terrible thing that the mind of Protestantism was not big enough to work for the good of the whole. Strife and envy ruled the day. When Melanchthon died at Wittenberg in 1560 he cried out against the dangers of this sort. "For two reasons I desire to leave this life," he said. "First that I may enjoy the sight which I long for of the Son of God and of the Church in Heaven. Next that I may be set free from the monstrous and implacable hatreds of the theologians." [2]

The Jesuits were also at work in the van of Catholic

[1] Hagenbach, p. 7. [2] Gardiner, p. 13.

Reaction. When Ignatius Loyola received the sanction of Pope Paul III for the foundation of the "Company of Jesus," the Reformation had firm hold on Europe. But in the twenty years which followed there was developed a spirit of reaction strong enough to threaten the great forces of the Reformation. The work of the Jesuits in the wilds of America and in Asia cannot be overestimated. Leibnitz took their side in the Chinese controversy at Rome. "In the controversy on China which is carried on at Rome to-day," he says, "I take the side of the Jesuits and have done so before." [1] But the home policy of the Jesuits does not call for the same praise. In the work of Catholic Reaction their aim was rather "ad gloriam majorem Papæ" than what it was on the Mission field, "ad gloriam majorem Dei." The supreme duty of the Jesuit is clearly stated in the official Constitutions. Over and above the usual threefold vow is a fourth pledge—"especially let the good will of the Apostolic See be maintained—the Apostolic See to which the Society is bound in devoted service." [2] By preaching, teaching and the confessional they extended their influence over men and women of all classes. Maximilian of Bavaria and Ferdinand of Austria were both educated at their college in Ingolstadt on the Danube. The consciences of emperors and sovereigns and of statesmen were in their keeping. Ferdinand supported them with an army in their work of winning his inherited dominions in Styria, Carinthia and Carniola back to Catholicism. There is no doubt about their attitude to Protestantism. Their whole theology was a polemic against the Reformation. Pulpit and school reverberated with these attacks. "As long as the breath of life is in us," they cried, "we will bark against the wolves for the defence of the Catholic Flock. What Hamilcar was to Hannibal Ignatius was to us; under his direction we have sworn eternal war at the Altar." [3] Wherever they went their aim was to destroy the work of the Reformers and to grant few concessions to Protestants who desired to return to the fold.

Leibnitz feared their narrowness. It was a danger to true patriotism and to the more universal attitude to religion which was developing in his mind. "They seek to avenge themselves of their adversaries," he wrote, "under pretext

[1] Dutens, VI. 1, 206. [2] *Constits. S.J.*
[3] *Imago primi sæculi S.J.*, p. 843; Pichler, p. 125.

that it is in the interests of their Order and in consequence in the interests of God Himself." [1] He also feared their attitude to science and knowledge in general. On July 14, 1690, he wrote to the Landgrave Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels: "These are no longer the Jesuits who lived at the beginning of the century, all of them clever and learned; the number of true and learned men among them is very small; I have not been able to find a single case in the lands of the Emperor and of the Duke of Bavaria who has a deep knowledge of history." [2] While Leibnitz spoke frequently in their favour, he was of the opinion that they were working against the better interests of Church and nation.

The conversion and re-conversion of dukes and princes was another damaging blow to Protestantism.[3] When a Catholic prince changed his religion he was bound to withdraw from office by the terms of the Augsburg Peace. His people were not to be influenced by his conversion. But when a Protestant prince was converted to Rome there was every possibility that his subjects would follow him, especially if he was a devoted and earnest ruler like the Landgrave Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels. It was certain that such a conversion meant a big missionary effort by the Court Jesuits. The conversion of Protestant princes was therefore a very serious matter. But it cannot be said that such conversions went on as rapidly before 1618 as they did after the Peace of Westphalia. In 1590 the Margrave of Baden went over, and what was more important the Count Palatine Wolfgang Wilhelm von Neuberg (in May 1614). The stupid nature of the relation of politics and religion in Germany at this time is brought out by the latter so-called conversion. It arose out of a quarrel with the Elector Johann Sigismund of Brandenburg; "in the disputes over the Jülich-Cleves Succession. Brandenburg and Neuberg shared with each other the possession of the lands; and the Elector Palatine had sought the hand of the daughter of the Elector, Anna Sophia. At a dispute the Elector allowed himself to be aroused to violence by drink. The consequence was that William renounced the matchmaking and, on the contrary, married a Bavarian princess, and in May 1614 went openly over to the Roman Church." [4]

[1] Rommel, II. 142.
[2] *Ibid.*, 224.
[3] See Appendix, p. 319.
[4] Hagenbach, pp. 6, 7.

The facts are clear about the growing strength of Catholicism, and Catholicism began to take the offensive. The occupation of the free city of Donauworth was an ominous sign (1607). The population, being entirely Protestant, made a somewhat coarse attack on a Catholic procession which had dared to show itself in their midst. The Reichshofrath, or Imperial Court, dealt with the punishment of the city, and Maximilian was ordered to march into the city and take possession of it, at the same time handing over the parish church to the Catholic clergy. Religious aggression had commenced, and the Protestants formed the Protestant Union, May 14, 1608, in self-defence. Maximilian retorted with the formation of the Catholic League. There was nothing to be expected but a terrific trial of strength. On the one hand stood the Roman Church, encouraged by a wonderful reaction which had set in on all sides, proud of its long tradition and of its array of Councils from Nicæa to Trent; shocked by the injury inflicted on it by a young revolutionary power, which had shot up with volcanic force from its midst and had seized its old episcopal and monastic institutions with the great landed domains and edifices, administering them in the interests of the Revolution. And on the other side stood Protestantism, with fresh memories of its leaders standing undismayed before emperors in the Diet, and with a great part of the people of the Empire on its side, and with an overwhelming confidence in the righteousness of its cause.

The crash came in the Thirty Years' War. Beginning in Bohemia, it spread to Germany and from Germany to the whole of Europe. At first it was predominantly a religious war, but in its later phases the political aspect assumed the upper hand, and the strange situation emerged in which Protestantism was saved by a Cardinal and Catholic France. For our purpose it is only necessary to notice the balance of religious influence. It is not too much to say that the Peace of Lübeck witnessed what looked like the annihilation of Protestantism (1623). But the landing of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden at Stralsund (1630) saved the situation. "Without him Protestantism in Germany would have collapsed." [1] Without him "the feeble Swiss Republics, Holland, Denmark, the Scandinavian Peninsula, and the

[1] Guidely, II. 418.

islands of the Baltic alone would have remained to Protestantism, except the island of Great Britain, which it is needless to say would have been its only stronghold." The tide turned, however, and when the respective parties had fought their best they were glad to settle down to a Peace which stamps the war as a drawn contest. The Peace of Westphalia put an end to religious wars in Europe for ever. Protestantism and Catholicism, and indeed Calvinism, would live peaceably—or as peaceably as possible—side by side, each contributing to society its special and peculiar gifts. Westphalia became the common law of Europe in reference to religion until the revolutionary movements at the close of the eighteenth century; and in this sense it was more satisfying than the Peace of nearly a century before.

The advance on the Peace of Augsburg is abundantly clear. Augsburg was a truce, Westphalia was a settlement; one led to the Thirty Years' War, the other was at least part of the stream which led to religious toleration. Calvinists were henceforth recognised on the same terms as Catholics or Protestants. But it is necessary to remember that complete toleration was not yet dreamed of. With slight modifications it was still limited to the religion of the Prince and not of the People. As late as 1729 the Archbishop of Salzburg was able to drive out thousands of Protestants into exile. The medieval idea, however, that no heretic could rule a Christian State was abandoned; the right of the individual to emigrate showed that the medieval theory of persecution had vanished, though, of course, persecution itself was not abandoned. It was a great step, on the whole, towards the modern idea of social order resting on deeper and less visible foundations than uniformity of ecclesiastical organisation.

Private religious opinions held in opposition to the prince received certain recognition. Existing compacts were to continue where Lutherans were actually under a reformed ruler and vice versa. In future cases the ruler was not to interfere with his subjects nor with religious institutions in churches, schools and universities as they were constituted at the time of the Peace. "Though the rulers might choose the form of Faith, they were bound to give dissenters a period of three years in which to dispose of their property before emigrating, and they were compelled to exercise

consideration in many ways even for those who remained. In Bohemia, Moravia and Austria, indeed, Ferdinand made no lasting concessions. . . . In Silesia he gave permission to build Protestant churches in certain specified towns." [1] All historians are agreed that there is some ambiguity over the question of private belief in opposition to the prince; the real secret is that wherever political ends were served the broader basis of toleration was adopted. Great nobles went so far as to tolerate Anabaptists, because their thrift enabled them to pay double rent on the manorial estates.

The knot of the "Reservatum Ecclesiasticum" was also cut. "It was finally decided to retain the measure, but to make it as applicable to Protestants who turned Catholic as it was the other way." [2] The date by which to try a particular case was fixed, after much discussion, as Jan. 1, 1624. If the occupant changed his religion after that date his occupancy would *ipso facto* cease, whether he were Protestant or Catholic. But here again experience proved that both parties could deceive with impunity.

One further benefit devolved on Protestantism. No religious Order was to be admitted into the convent of another Order except when that Order was extinct, and even then no Order founded since the Reformation could be introduced. This was an indirect attack on the Jesuits.

It is not surprising, on the face of it, that strict Catholics viewed the Peace with dismay. The Papal Nuncio, Cardinal Fabius Chigi (afterwards Alexander VII), protested in the middle of the Peace preparations at Osnabrück. Innocent X declared all points of special concession to Protestants were to be regarded as null and void (by the Bull "*Zelo domus Dei*," published Jan. 3, 1651). But it was of no avail; the Peace was formally confirmed in the Imperial Diet, 1654. "Notwithstanding that the Pope Innocent X protested against the Westphalian Peace," said Leibnitz, "the need of public safety is more powerful than the positive law of the Church. Peace could not indeed be initiated except by the Emperor and the Empire, nor could full liberty to Protestants be conceded by Ecclesiastical and Papal jurisdiction." [3]

The manner in which Leibnitz received the Peace may

[1] Henderson, L., 495. [2] *Ibid.*, 493.
[3] *Dissertatio*, p. 187 [quoted Pichler, II. 174].

be taken as the attitude of the best minds on the Protestant side in Germany. He regarded it as " the foundation of the Peace of all Germany, and, as it were, the Palladium of the People." [1] He plucked its central secret and took it like a flower from the stem. Nothing in history—and he was the best-versed historian of his day—could show such an advance in the relation of Church and State as the Peace of Westphalia. Behind was the medieval idea of Gregory and his successors; in front was the modern theory of Cavour of " Libera chiesa in Libero Stato " (a Free Church in a Free State); between came the terms of 1648. The greatness of the settlement is only realised when it is remembered that the Reformers themselves were unable to form a firm and stable conviction of the relation of Church and State. Luther and Melanchthon were agreed that a change must come in the interests of true religion and of nationality. They had learned from the generation before them that the Papacy must be limited by constitutional and federal influences. In the words of Nicholas of Cues, " The Pope is not Universal Bishop, but chief over the other bishops, and we base the force of the Sacred Councils not on the Pope, but on the consent of all." [2] But the Reformers were too near the Reformation to see what development the new relation of Church and State would take. Time was needed to settle it. Luther changed his mind frequently with changing conditions. The Jurists were no less divided than the theologians. " What was not possible to scientific theory was brought to consciousness by the bloody experience of the great war, and found its expression in the Peace of Westphalia." [3] The new orientation of authority " did not rest on a selfish fiction and invention like the Papal world rule, but on the requirement of the nation, in the public need as the chief law of the State's life." A greater liberty to the individual was much to have been desired, but we must confess that the times were not ripe for it. " Therefore those men who stood high above their days were quite pleased with the success of the Peace of Westphalia as a preliminary." [4] The territorial power of the prince in religion (jus reformandi exercitium religionis) remained;

[1] *Dissert. de matrimonii validitate*, Klopp, III. 152.
[2] *de Concord Cath.* II. 13.
[3] Pichler, p. 171.
[4] *Ibid.*, I. 172.

the Protestant sects outside Lutheranism and Calvinism were unrecognised; but it was a great religious peace.

The whole of Germany resounded with joy. Festivities went on throughout Germany similar to those at the Town Hall of Nürnberg. In Sept. 1649 in this city everything was done to mark the greatness of the occasion. Many of the chief people of the city assembled in the high vaulted hall amidst flowers and candelabra. "Water for washing the hands was handed round in silver tankards and basins. The Te Deum and Gloria were sung to the accompaniment of kettledrums, trumpets and other instruments." [1] The table was laden with splendid fare, while bread and a couple of oxen were distributed among the poor. White and red wine poured out of the lion's mouth in front of the Town Hall window to the great joy of the crowd, while the lion held a palm twig under its right paw and a broken sword under its left.

Thanksgiving services were held in many cities in both Protestant and Catholic churches. About the same time as service was going on in the cathedral at Prague, a similar thanksgiving service was taking place in the parish church of Regensburg, Oct. 3, 1649. Church and State joined in thanksgiving for deliverance from a long and cruel carnage.

It is interesting to remember that one kingdom in Germany went beyond the terms of the Westphalian Peace in its idea of toleration. Brandenburg was the cradle of the modern point of view. The Great Elector wrote to Louis XIV in 1666 on behalf of the Huguenots. When his words proved of no avail he employed every effort to care for the scattered people of France. He set an example to Germany in this respect which was followed by the princes of the House of Luneburg, and by the Margraves of Hesse, Cassel, Hamburg and Baireuth. When the exiles passed into Frankfurt he sent funds to his Minister, Matthaus Merian, for their relief, as he also did to Amsterdam and Hamburg. Everything for their comfort was prepared in the Mark of Brandenburg itself. Ernst von Grumbkow was made General Intendant to care for their needs. "A special Court of Justice ensured them their rights, special Consistories their religious customs. Of more than 600 preachers who fled from France, 30 found

[1] Hagenbach, pp. 83, 83.

a lodging in the Mark. In Berlin two churches were handed over to the refugees, and some of their preachers thereby put into office." [1] In other places students were allowed to continue their theological studies at the expense of the Elector, and in Berlin a special French school was erected. In a list drawn up by a refugee for the year 1697 there were no less than 12,279 persons recorded as having been saved by the generosity of the Elector. Protection and refuge was granted also to Catholics on the one hand and to Socinians on the other.[2] Nothing was too broad for Brandenburg.

From this picture of enlightenment we are bound to turn to the terrible picture of devastation after the Thirty Years' War. No nation either before or since has had to begin life so completely anew. The strong man had turned soldier and often found a delight in robbery and plunder; the young girl had often turned to a life of shame to save her from starvation; men, women and children had followed the armies across miles of country for the mere satisfaction of hunger and thirst. In Thuringia, we are told, of 1717 houses standing in 19 villages before the war, only 627 were standing after the war in the year 1649, and many of them were untenanted. Only 316 families could be found to occupy these homes which had been tenanted by 1773 families before the devastation. At the universities the same barrenness prevailed. In 1626 Heidelberg had only two students. All the professors save Calixtus had made good their escape from Helmstadt. The number of matriculations had fallen from 300 to 100 at Jena in a short period. And the Church bears marks of serious decay upon it. Many preachers were driven by the horrors of war from their homes, and many were swept away by the plague and the hunger which followed in the wake of the war. Young and inexperienced candidates or even unworthy characters were presented to the priesthood under the pressing need of the times. In 1630, for instance, two preachers died at Stendal who had been brewers for many years. Others did day-work by woodcutting and threshing; so pitiful an object did they often present that the pity of soldiers, out for prey, was showered on them. Public worship suffered terribly. Where the churches were destroyed service was held in barns or in the fields. Michael Ludwig, priest at Sonnenfeld in

[1] Hagenbach, pp. 116, 117. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

Saxony, from 1633 preached to his congregation in an open wood, and used a drum to call his people to service. Holy places were often profaned. A treatise on "the present troubled and miserable condition of the Mark of Brandenburg" (über den gegenwärtigen betrübten und kümmerlichen Zustand der Mark Brandenburg) of 1641 mentions the fact that after the sermon, fencing masters, jumping men, bear and monkey men and others would often show their buffoonery before the people. In some parts open atheism was rampant. "The austerity of public worship among the soldiers in the camps of Gustavus Adolphus and of Bernhard, as also at the period of the Great Margrave, according to which no soldier dared to neglect public worship, and by which each body of camp troops carried with them continuously the New Testament and the Psalms, could not prevent the great profligacy and practical atheism, which, always preceding a theoretical atheism, prevailed among the soldiery of that time." Vulgar women had the audacity to don the beautiful vestments of the Church, which they had stolen, and dared to drink each other's health from the wine of the Altar chests which they had robbed.[1]

There is no doubt that these troubles were derogatory to the cause of Protestantism. People argued that the old was better than the new, and from the Peace of Westphalia to the end of the century there is little to record of general progress on the Protestant side. Schuppius, in a sermon of 1656, employs the lament of the "good old times" to arouse his hearers from the lethargy of the day. He paints a picture of Sunday of the past, in contrast to the Sunday after the Thirty Years' War. "When," he says, "in former times Sunday arrived and the Vesper bell was rung all the shops and work-places were closed. Parents said to their children, 'Dear children, clear everything away, not only in the house but in the heart; Sunday is here; God help us to keep it with holy works and words and thoughts.' Then they began to pray, to read and to sing, and when they lay down to sleep they said, 'Help us, dear God, to sleep well that we may be ready to listen to Thy Word to-morrow'—Christians did not act as the people act to-day; for to-day they prepare for their Sunday with brandy before they enter church, and prefer to quicken their bodies with food and

[1] Hagenbach, pp. 526, 527.

drink rather than with the Word of God, and bring a drunken soul to the House of God." [1] We may read such evidence with judgment, but it does seem to point to the change which was passing over the more rigid expression of older Protestantism. It follows the same lines as the story of Prince Charles Gustavus, afterwards King of Sweden, who corresponded at great length with his mother as to whether he should have a new coat made for everyday or whether he should take one of his Sunday coats for general use; or with the extraordinary Swedish law which forbade the wearing of lace as late as 1644. The times after the Thirty Years' War altered all this and gave a broader expression to Protestantism.[2]

At the same time this increasing breadth of outlook did not mitigate confessional hatred.

> "Lutheran, Papist, Calvinist
> Stood out against each other.
> Only one doubt remained:
> Who was their common Mother?" [3]

The Thirty Years' War was immediately followed by the Brüderkrieg. Protestant and Catholic literature was packed with vituperation and hatred expressed in uncouth terms. The coarsest nicknames were used on both sides. One party called the other Antichrist. Fabricius of Helmstadt felt it his duty to warn the Lutherans that their attacks on Rome may find them with Antichrist in their own hearts.

But the bitterness between Lutherans and Calvinists was greater still. A typical example comes from Alsace. The city of Strassburg had gradually been captured by Lutheranism. The Calvinists consisted of only a few families; their preacher came from Basel. But what a battle it was for them to hold their worship in undisturbed enjoyment! They were not allowed to hold any meetings in the city itself, but only in the neighbouring places of Bischweiler and Wolfisheim, which belonged to the Count of Hanau. During the course of the building of the church at Wolfisheim lightning struck a house, and the Lutherans saw in it the sign of God's anger against them because they had wanted to help their Reformed Brethren to build a church, and henceforth they refused to convey further building

[1] Hagenbach, pp. 524, 525. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 529. [3] Pichler, I. 115.

material. When the church was finally built the Council of the city forbade the Lutheran coachmen to drive the Calvinists to their churches, and refused permission to the Reformed Minister to visit the sick in the city. "We see from this example how great was the tension still" between Lutherans and Calvinists.[1]

Moderation and toleration were sorely needed. The besetting sins of the times were not those lamented by Chaucer in his day, but of a much more subtle kind. Envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness were rife. In the youth of Leibnitz the universities were not so much centres of learning as centres of confessional prejudice, and even the most liberal of them all, the University of Helmstadt, had difficulty in securing a free and liberal discussion of any question.

Again, the Jesuits took advantage of Protestant weaknesses. The Landgrave Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels had yielded to the persuasions of the Jesuits and of an Italian Capucin, Valerianus Magnus, and had gone over to Catholicism in 1648. Johann Friedrich, Duke of Braunschweig and afterwards Duke of Hanover, followed him in 1651. But by far the most important conversion was that of Friedrich August, Elector of Saxony, which took place in 1697. His policy was to pave the way to the Polish throne. But what a blow to the Protestant cause! The Jesuits were delighted; Leibnitz and the whole Protestant world sank into despair.[2] Would the land which was the cradle of the Reformation suddenly revert to Romanism and become the centre of Catholic Reaction? Fortunately for Protestantism the people remained true. In many districts, however, both Prince and people were affected. "Not a few Princes were drawn towards Rome by the natural affinity between State absolutism and ecclesiastical concentration, agreeing with the Jesuits that obedience is the only remedy against dissidency and insubordination to authority in Church and State. The main cause of the defection of the mass of the people in Protestant countries was the moral decadence and mental decrepitude of the Clergy together with the repellent effect of their dry disquisitions in the pulpit accompanied by frigid forms of Worship." [3]

[1] Hagenbach, p. 147. [2] Pichler, II. 490.
[3] *Cambridge Modern History*, V. 744.

The final blow which leads us directly to the depression of Protestantism in Leibnitz's day is the literary activity of Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux. The *Expositio de la doctrine catholique* appeared first in French on Dec. 1, 1671, while Bossuet was Bishop of Condam. The Latin translation was already begun in 1672, but first completed in 1675 and not published until April 1678, at Antwerp. The first German edition appeared at Molsheim in 1680.[1] It appeared in Germany therefore at the very moment when Protestantism was staggering under its confessional strife. What must have been the effect of Bossuet's beautifully written work, with its atmosphere of gentle persuasion upon the reader, who had grown accustomed to bitterness and narrowness and party passion in religious controversy? And his message, appealing to the reader's love of truth and of justice, and couched in terms of sound sense and obvious devotion, was merely this—Protestants have misunderstood Catholicism; if they really understood it they would be bound to enter the Roman fold. The message was sweet and its burden was light.

We are not surprised that the Jesuits and Maimbourg were offended by the work of Bossuet, but there can be no doubt about its effect on Protestantism.[2] Turenne seems to have been won over by it; the book made a great impression on his niece; so much so that she asked the Reformed preacher Claude to conduct with Bossuet a discussion on it in her presence. This took place in 1678, and as usual both sides claimed a victory. It is not surprising that Brueys, la Bastide and Noguier, three of the men who had opposed Bossuet, were won over by the *Exposition*, though it is impossible to say with Saurin (*Necrology*, 1704) that all conversions in France after 1671 were due to this book. There are no very distinct signs of direct conversions from this source in Germany, but we can be certain that the same influence was exercised there as in France.

A review of the course of events within the Church in Germany from the Reformation makes it clear that Protestantism was supreme in 1550, that the Catholic Reaction

[1] Foucher, I. 29.
[2] Hagenbach, p. 379; but Turenne seems to have been converted a few years before 1671.

turned the scale well before 1618, and that, in 1648, the Peace of Westphalia had done much to strengthen the Protestant cause. But at the time of the publication of the *Expositio* in German (1680) Protestantism was sinking rapidly into a second place. Leibnitz described his age in the words which are placed at the head of this Chapter: "As often as I think of the perilous condition of affairs and of our present lethargy and false purposes, I am ashamed of our position in the eyes of Posterity. . . . We quarrel over little things; we are indifferent to great things; so that it is almost irksome to meditate on the history of this present time; so much do we Germans demonstrate by our actions the sinister judgments of others upon us." [1]

[1] Quoted at head of chapter.

CHAPTER II

LEIBNITZ AND HIS APPROACH TO THE CHURCHES

"Es ist an erster Stelle nicht der Philosoph, nicht der Polyhistor, nicht der Diplomat, sondern der ernst religiöse Character, der echte Christ und der glühende Patriot Leibniz, welcher die Frage über die Mittel und Wege zur Erreichung einer Versöhnung der fanatisch gegen einander erbitterten kirchlichen Parteien sich vorlegte."—PICHLER, II., p. 432 : trans. p. 41 f.

THE Thirty Years' War had a profound influence on religious and political thought. There was bound to be a reaction against the petty religious hatreds of a whole century and an urgent attempt on the part of political thinkers to cut the cord which bound politics firmly to the confessional. A new mental attitude, expressing itself in a hundred strange forms, developed quickly under the pressing urgency of a terrible and agonising war. In politics and religion it was an attitude of critical independence of the past.

Hugo Grotius led the way by his celebrated treatise, *De jure belli et pacis*, published at Frankfort seven years after the opening of the war (1625). The basis of society and of government is found outside the Church; Roman Law, expounded in the interest of the Church and of the Empire, must be superseded by more basic principles of right and of society. "If the pages of a writer like Grotius . . . be studied carefully it will be seen how to him the world was always one; that true principles in politics are to be found partly by reasoning but still more by the distilled essence of thought ancient and modern, by something akin at least to the comparative study of institutions, and by the wise selection of historical instances which . . . are valued always for their significance as parts of a system." [1]

However much other political thinkers differed from

[1] Figgis, *Gerson to Grotius*, pp. 249, 250.

Grotius and from one another they were agreed on one principle: that it was imperative to stand outside the political prejudices of the past and to find some more fundamental basis for the thought of the new era. Jacob Thomasius, Samuel Puffendorff and Thomas Hobbes arrived at different conclusions; but they set out together on the principle of independent search. Appeals were made to "natural law," to the fiction of a "social contract," to reason and system: in great contrast to the religious–theological politics of the past.[1]

In religious thought there is abundant evidence of the same mental attitude. Pietists and Rationalists won many adherents. Those who felt the spirit of independence most took refuge in the intuitive-Pietism of men like Philipp Jacob Spener and August Hermann Franke, or in the sweet reasonableness of William Chillingworth and Anthony Collins. Among good Churchmen there were many who employed every effort to find a place of rest from the burning antagonisms of Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Calvinist, Jansenist and Jesuit, Armenian and Reformed, Puritan and Anglican.

This condition of critical and independent thought took a peculiar direction in reference to the relation of the Churches to one another. It nurtured a line of thinkers, who were convinced that the Churches could no longer adopt a policy of warlike antagonism, as expressed in the formula used by Gustavus Adolphus for the Thirty Years' War as a strife "between God and the Devil"; and that the milder policy of exclusion was insufficient to meet the needs of religion after 1648. They were fully convinced that the Churches must settle their disputes by arguments and not by arms, by conciliation rather than by conquest. They accepted the terms arranged at Osnabrück, that religious conditions should continue "semper et ubique" as from the most favourable date in 1624, but with their prophetic vision fixed on a future "day of religious reunion."[2] They were men of great learning and of noble outlook, often misunderstood by the independence of their views, and yet all inspired by a passion to deliver Germany from the perils of another disastrous war and to save the Peace from the dangerous political divisions which came in the wake of religious dis-

[1] Cf. Hagenbach, pp. 444, 445. [2] *Cambridge Modern History*, IV. 412.

union. And among them none stood higher in knowledge and in sincerity of purpose than Gottfried Wilhelm Freiherr von Leibnitz.

Leibnitz was born at Leipzig on June 21, 1646. His father, a jurist and Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University, died when the boy was only six years of age, but not without expressing wonder at his remarkable precocity. His mother devoted her widowhood entirely to the education of her son. She was a devoted Christian of the Lutheran confession, but with infinite charity towards all. There is no doubt that Leibnitz inherited her gifts of patience and conciliation as well as that deep religious faith which remained to him throughout life and strengthened him in the bitter loneliness of his last years. "We can easily imagine," writes Guhrauer in his excellent Biography, "that the seeds of virtue and religion, the reverence for divine things, were early and lastingly set in young Leibnitz under the influence of this model." [1]

The home life at Leipzig was favourable to his amazing love of learning. He was never to experience the penury in which many great men have been reared; and the quiet atmosphere of his mother's home started him off from the nursery on his prodigious adventure into every department of knowledge. "Es bildet ein Talent sich in der Stille."

The wonderful energy of the man is latent in the boy. Imagine a boy of eight years beginning with Livius and the Chronological Treasury of Sethus Calvisius! "These were scarcely in my hands," he says, "but I gulped them down, and indeed I understood Calvisius fairly well." [2] Livy was more difficult, but he persisted in going over it again and again until he was able to make sense of it without the use of a dictionary.

When he succeeded in obtaining the key to his father's library he gave vent to the deepest passion of his soul. He longed for knowledge. "I rejoiced over this announcement," he says in reference to the library key, "as if I had found a treasure." [3] He had a deep longing to read Cicero, Quintilian, Seneca, Pliny, Herodotus, Xenophon, Plato, as well as the Greek and Latin Fathers. "These I read," he says, in a characteristic phrase, "as instinct led me and I found

[1] Guhrauer, I. 9. [2] *Ibid.*, 11. [3] *Ibid.*, 11.

pleasure in the extraordinary variety of subjects." [1] This delight in the manifold nature of knowledge remained with him to the end.

His love of encyclopædic knowledge was balanced from the first by a liking for the works of the great controversialists, especially in the province of religion. In a letter to Jablonski, 23 Jan. 1700, on the occasion of the controversy over Predestination, he writes: "I have from my early youth, when I was scarcely capable of such things, meditated on these things." Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, Jacob Andreas' *Colloquium* and the *Ægidii Hunni scripta* had fallen into his hands. His instinct for discussion was aroused, and he confesses in the same letter: "I was eager to read not only many controversial works from our side and from the Reformed, but also those of the Jesuits and Armenians, the Thomists and the Jansenists." [2] He found that it was useful to read the other side of a question, and prepared himself for that fair-minded policy, based on wide knowledge, which made him the greatest conciliator of the day. "Here we already find," adds Guhrauer, "the foundation of Leibnitz's later efforts for the establishment of peace in the Church." [3]

At Easter 1661 the youth of fifteen years was enrolled as a student of philosophy under Jacob Thomasius. The University of Leipzig was not wide enough to hold him; his private studies were far in advance of the lectures which he heard. Descartes fell into his hands. The story of his walk through a "Waldchen" near Leipzig, called "Rosenthal," is told in a letter to Remond of Montwort. The battle was fought out. "Mechanism won at last the supremacy and led me to mathematics." [4]

Meanwhile, however, he continued his philosophic studies under the influence of his conversion. In his first academic publication (*De Principio Individui*, March 30, 1663) he shows that his knowledge of scholastic philosophy is profound, but in contrast to it his whole system was to revolve round the principle of individuality. He took the side of the Nominalists against the Realists and dreamt of a place in the sun with Bacon, Galileo and Descartes as comrades.

It was time to seek some practical field of activity. The relatives of Leibnitz anxiously sought to direct him into the steps of his father; he was to be a legal practitioner. A

[1] Guhrauer, I. 12. [2] *Ibid.*, 24. [3] *Ibid.*, 24. [4] *Ibid.*, 27.

kind friend, who was Assessor at Court (Assessor am Hofgericht), frequently took him to his house and taught him to draw up judgments, and gave him instruction in other departments of the law. But Leibnitz declares that he delighted most in the work of an advocate. In 1663 his legal studies were advanced by six months at Jena University, where he heard lectures in jurisprudence by Faulkner, and on natural law by Weigel. On Dec. 3 (1664) he published the *Specimen difficultatis in jure seu Quæstiones Philosophicæ amæniores ex jure collectæ*, for which he was made "Magister Philosophiæ." It was obvious that his ideas were in advance of the time. He indicated the two great objects of the modern science of law, the first a philosophic inquiry into the principles of right, and the second a systematic arrangement of the matter handed down to us by the ancient jurists. The pedantic assessors at Leipzig determined to stay his academic progress. They refused him the doctorate, on which he had set his mind. This fact, together with the death of his mother in 1664, made him quit his native city for ever. "Thus Leipzig and Saxony, the land of Leibnitz's birth, lost the great man who was to be the pride of the German nation. Leibnitz, after this time, never had a desire to return thither; indeed it has been said that in later life he only made unwilling and casual mention of his native city. It is true, on the other hand, that we know of no attempt or proposal by which Saxony desired to win him back again. The memory of him in his native city is as a myth; we have sought the house, yea the street, in vain where the great Leibnitz saw the light of day; nobody there has knowledge of it." [1]

The genius of Leibnitz needed ever new experience to develop it. We cannot therefore regret the departure from his native city, for the University of Altdorf, in the Province and under the rule of the Free Town of Nürnberg. Here, on Nov. 5, 1666, he received his doctorate, his work being also of such high merit that he was offered a professorship. His field, however, was the world and not the specialised work of a professorial chair; he wisely refused the offer.

In Nürnberg he was much impressed by the independence of the people. There was no mimicking of France either in language or in customs, and many of his later ideas were

[1] Guhrauer, I. 40.

born here. But Nürnberg stands pre-eminent in his life as the town in which he was introduced to one of the noblest statesmen of the age, Baron John Christian von Boineburg. Leibnitz had joined a society for scientific research and alchemy; it was a closed Fellowship of so-called Rosicrucians (fraternitas roseæ crucis), and he was made secretary. His duty was to register experiments and to undertake foreign correspondence. The self-delusion of some of the Fellows amused him, but on the whole he enjoyed his office. "Nürnberg," he says in looking back, "initiated my studies in chemistry, and I do not regret that I learned in youth what should conduce to prudence in my manhood." [1] Apparently he is thinking of the self-delusion of most of alchemy of his time. There was certainly more alchemy than science in the transactions of the learned Fellowship. But the chief value of the society, to Leibnitz's future, was the fact that Boineburg was a member. And through the Fellowship Leibnitz was carried into the life, both political and religious, of a great German Court.

Boineburg had been Chief Minister at the Court of the Elector and Archbishop of Mainz, John Philip von Schonborn, from 1652 to 1664. At that date he was overthrown by the French Party within the State. Reconciled to the Prince in 1668, he lived in retirement at Frankfort, occupied by studies of a literary and historical character. As a matter of fact the fall of Boineburg had been of tremendous value to him as a statesman. He was consulted, not only by the Prince at Mainz, where he lived during certain periods, but by numerous other princes and politicians. "In that critical period after the Peace of Aachen to the War of Louis XIV against Holland" he was "the Adviser and Oracle of the Most Illustrious Princes of Germany." [2]

In the spring of 1667 Leibnitz was introduced to this scholar and statesman. It was the turning-point of his life. Henceforth there would be no danger of his study running like a desert stream into the arid sand; he would be carried into the vast field of European politics; he would have to make up his mind and give advice on the pressing problems of the day; he would have to take a very practical stand in the work of restoring unity to the Churches. So important was this event that Pichler makes the following comment

[1] Guhrauer, I. 47. [2] *Ibid.*, 61.

upon it. "By a very lucky chance had Leibnitz found in early life . . . a warm friend and patron in one of the best patriots and most prominent statesmen, to wit, in the Minister Baron von Boineburg of the Electorate of Mainz, whose influence for his whole future career was of such decided weight. If Leibnitz considered what looked like the completely accidental nature of his acquaintance with Boineburg this could surely only help to strengthen him in his view of the pre-established harmony of all things and to recognise the ways of Providence in all, even in the apparently least considerable chances of life." [1]

The attention of the Prince himself was won by the publication in Frankfort of Leibnitz's *Methodus nova discendæ docendæque jurisprudentiæ*, which was dedicated to the Prince. The work had a great and immediate influence. Hermann Conring approved of it, Boineburg having sent him a copy for his opinion on it; Conring went so far as to say that he thought it would gain approval not only in Germany and in other parts of Europe but also in France, where Louis XIV was preparing his new Law Book. The work was of such value that a new edition was issued in the eighteenth century by Christopher Wolff, and Hugo speaks highly of it in the nineteenth century.

The important fact, however, is that Leibnitz was called from Nürnberg to Mainz. His immediate work was that of helping Dr. Hermann A. Lasser, the Hofrath and Hofgericht's assessor at Mainz, to revise the Roman Law Book in face of the needs of the State. The result was a collaboration published in 1668 under the title of *Ratio corporis juris reconcinnandi*. Leibnitz was always on the side of new law books for the separate European States and of the remodelling of the Corpus Juris everywhere.

An interesting picture of Leibnitz at this time is provided by the correspondence of Boineburg and Conring, and especially by a letter of the former dated 22 April, 1670. Conring desired to know who the young man was and what was his position. The answer was as follows: "He is a young man of twenty-four years, from Leipzig, . . . he is completely conversant with philosophy, having reconciled successfully the old with the new philosophy. He is a mathematician, with a knowledge of physics, medicine and

[1] Pichler, I. 6, 7.

the whole of mechanics; he is industrious and ardent. In religion he takes an independent line (suæ spontis); moreover he is a member of your (the Lutheran) Church. The philosophy of law and indeed, wonderful to relate, the practice of law, is at his command; he is attached to you by ties of love and veneration. He is staying at Mainz, and lives (lodges) with Lasser the Duke's adviser, with whom, as you know, he is collaborating for a juster arrangement of the law." [1]

In 1670 (summer) Leibnitz was made a member of the chief Court of Appeal at Mainz (Rath am Ober-Revisions-Collegium zu Mainz), the highest tribunal in the State, having the "jus de non appellando." This seems to have been a reward for services rendered in connection with the Polish Crown. John Casimir, King of Poland, had abdicated of his own will. The Catholic Count Palatine, Philip William von Neuburg, was among the Pretenders to the throne, and the Great Elector, Frederick William of Brandenburg, recommended him to entrust his cause to Boineburg. A mission was sent from Mainz on his behalf, for which Leibnitz prepared the way by publishing his *Specimen demonstrationum politicarum pro rege Polonorum eligendo, auctore Georgio Ulicovio Lithuano* (G. V. L.). The work was written in the winter of 1668 and published the following year at Dantzig. "It was the first attempt to transfer the method of mathematical demonstration, which had hitherto been employed in philosophy and natural law (since Spinoza and Hobbes), to a given question of politics or of diplomacy." [2] The mission failed and Michael Wiesnowiescki (1669–1674), who had nothing but his name and good looks to recommend him, was chosen king by the Poles. But the treatise gave Leibnitz a great name. Boineburg called him "Summus summarum rerum Tractor et Actor," and Leibnitz always thought highly of the tractate because it was his first application of his principles to political questions. No doubt also he was delighted that he had passed from the study to the street, for he always hated purposeless study.

The work of Leibnitz in connection with the political dangers of 1670 and his attempt to restrain the attacks of Louis XIV on the Triple Alliance are but a continuation of the work to which Boineburg had introduced him.

[1] Guhrauer, I. 55. [2] *Ibid.*, 64.

France seemed likely to break the peace which had lasted for a quarter of a century. The Duke of Mainz and his advisers were anxious to prevent war. In July 1670 Boineburg and Leibnitz were present at a meeting of the Dukes of Mainz and Treves. The result of that meeting was the publication of *Thoughts on Public Safety* (Securitas publica interna et externa), which Leibnitz wrote in three days (6–8 Aug. 1670) during a stay at the watering-place Schwalbach in Nassau. The message of the work is a warning to Emperor and people of the new ambitions of Louis; it places a German National Union on a higher plane than the Triple Alliance, which Leibnitz suspects as a "bruised reed." The Emperor must be informed that the French have assumed a dangerous attitude and that an immediate union of the German States is imperative. Germany must be united and cease to be the ball at Europe's feet.

Louis was not to be restrained in his striving for the hegemony of Europe. In Nov. 1670 he attacked the Duke of Lorraine and broke up the Triple Alliance by the Secret Treaty of Dover with Charles II of England. Leibnitz was again the political spokesman of his country, but this time in the ears of all Europe. He applied the idea of Marino Saruto (a Venetian of the fourteenth century in "Secreta fidelium crucis") to the occasion. France was to be averted from pretensions in Europe by a crusade against the Turk. On Jan. 20, 1672, a treatise, embodying the idea, was sent to Louis himself under the title "De Expeditione Ægyptiaca, epistola ad regem Franciæ scripta." Boineburg wrote a covering letter in which he speaks of the author as a man of great capabilities, and asks for a conference between Leibnitz and His Majesty. On Feb. 12, 1672, Leibnitz was invited by the King to explain the project; and on Mar. 19 of the same year he set out for Paris with one servant, reaching St. Germain safely, only to find that "his proposition was heard, taken into consideration and rejected." [1]

To Leibnitz this political errand was all-important. Just as he had been lifted out of the academic surroundings of Nürnberg into the larger world of a German Court, so now he went one step further into the very centre of European thought and politics, centred in Paris. Boineburg asked him to stay in Paris, partly to watch over the education of

[1] Guhrauer, I. 106.

young Boineburg and partly to continue his studies. The stay in Paris was a prelude to the great work of Leibnitz's life,[1] at the Court of Hanover. Meeting great representatives of the new philosophy like Arnaud and Malebranche, and great mathematicians like Huygens, he was prepared for his work on the Differential Calculus and for his profound contribution to philosophy. But all these things are subordinate to the main work of his great period—the Reunion of the Churches.

Sufficient has therefore been said to show the nature of the mind of Leibnitz with its penetrating search into every department of knowledge, with its great outlook on the whole of life, and with its keen propensity towards application to the problems of the day. When the Duke John Frederick of Hanover (Braunschweig-Luneburg) invited him to accept the post of librarian and private councillor (Bibliothekar und Rath), Leibnitz came fully equipped from Paris to undertake the greatest if not the most successful task of his life. He arrived at Hanover in the last days of 1676.

Some writers have lamented the "misuse" of genius which should have been employed more fully on philosophical, mathematical or scientific research and not on the futilities of the Churches. Others have lamented the fact that the genius of Leibnitz was wasted in writing histories of an obscure German dynasty, such as his *Scriptores Rerum Brunsvicensium*, *Acessiones historicæ* and *Annales Imperii Occidentis Brunsvicienses*, or with promoting the politics of an insignificant line, or in writing abstract treatises on geological questions connected with the mines in the Harz Mountains; but the truth is that his active mind embraced all these subjects with perfect equanimity.

It is no exaggeration to say, however, that the great task of the last fifty years of his life was a religious one. All his previous experience had prepared him for it; his religious home training; his experience of practical politics, into which religious questions entered at every turn; his comprehensive study of theology and especially of the controversial writers of the past; his wide reading and tolerant spirit, partly inherited and partly acquired; and his almost

[1] Racine was at his height in Paris; Molière died one year after Leibnitz's arrival, 1673, though Leibnitz had seen him play in one of his works.

encyclopædic knowledge made him the greatest supporter of Church unity that the world has yet known. From Hanover he corresponded with the great religious writers of his day, with Mons. Pelisson, the pliant Court historian of Louis XIV, with the Landgrave Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels, but above all with Jacques Benigne Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux. In short, he dedicated the whole of his life—knowledge in mathematics, philosophy, law, history, science—to the deliverance of the Churches from the false religious passion, which had been so evident in the opening stages of the Thirty Years' War. It was a noble task and the climax of a sincere and devoted life.

It is amazing to think how neglected this most important aspect of Leibnitz's work has been in the past. Contemporaries gloried in his Differential Calculus, in his minute historical researches, and with some exceptions in his philosophical system, but there is scarcely a trace of interest in his theological and religious activities. He was regarded as an extraordinary scholar, " a man whose unique and brilliant learning was honoured and admired by all the world," or as a " living encyclopædia," as the Elector, John Frederick, was fond of naming him. Even Fontenelle, who read a eulogy of him before the learned " Académie royale des Sciences de Paris " in 1716, makes no important reference to his work for the Church. To Fontenelle and his confrères Leibnitz is an all-round scholar with an influence in the Courts of Princes—a historian, a scientist, a mathematician, a philosopher, and even a poet. The only reference to his long and stupendous efforts after Church unity is concerned with the attempt to introduce the Anglican Liturgy into Hanover. But there is not a word about the long efforts for Church unity in the Court of Hanover, and not a mention of the long and important correspondence with Bossuet, a *French* bishop.

The obituary summary of the life of Leibnitz in the *Acta Eruditorum* contains nothing of his work for the Churches. Feller sums up the contemporary view when he says, " The future centuries may celebrate their great men, France its Descartes, Malebranche, and Hôpital; Belgium its Huygens and Bernouilli; England its Boyle and Newton; Germany, too, possesses, as an imperishable ornament for

subsequent years, its Leibnitz, philosopher, historian, learned in law, an incomparable mathematician; in a word, the real encyclopædia, with whom it can take up battle for the first place with any nation." [1]

The list of examples of this sort might be carried on indefinitely. J. G. Walsh in his *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten* (Jena, 1733–36) enumerates all the important works relating to the difficulties between the three Christian Churches of the West, but knows nothing of Leibnitz's work in this respect. The Church historians Jager, Carolus, Weissmann are the same. Probably the only aspect of Leibnitz's religious work about which contemporaries seem to have been informed was the puerile attack on the so-called unchristian implications of the pre-established harmony. Löscher, the head of the Orthodox school, declared it "suspect," and insisted that the youth of Germany be warned against this dangerous heretic. An interesting document on the controversy is extant. It is described in the edition of Dutens (I. p. ccix) as a "Disputatio de Philosophia Leibnitii Christianæ Religioni haud perniciosa, auctore Christiano Kortholto, M.A., S.R.M., Daniæ Legat. Viennensis, V.D.M." The writer describes the pre-eminence which Leibnitz justly holds in mathematics, history, jurisprudence, etymology and other subjects. But, while many people admire his philosophy, "there are not wanting those who think that the principles of his philosophy are full of danger and harmful to the Christian religion, and who, with great emotion, warn everybody that they should be on their guard against the same, if in mind and heart they are anxious about the most holy teaching of our Saviour." [2] The chief ground of complaint was in connection with the great topic of the times—free will. People said that the Principles of Leibnitz "destroy all liberty." But it is obvious, as Kortholt shows, that "it never entered into the mind of Leibnitz to want to destroy free will, in the defence of which he was very much occupied, as all his works, and especially his *Théodicée*, loudly proclaim. I will give one passage only as an example: "I reckon that our wills are free, not only from compulsion but also from necessity." [3]

Such a puerile attack, based on an insufficient and inaccurate knowledge of the philosophy of Leibnitz, was the

[1] *Supplementum Vitæ L.* 1718. [2] Dutens, I. *in loco.* [3] *Ibid.*

only part of his theological and religious work which moved his contemporaries.

The reason for this neglect is not far to seek. It lay in the peculiar nature of his theological works, or indeed of his works in general. A scholar in the accepted sense of the term, as the author of large and voluminous works, Leibnitz was not. By far the greater number of his writings sprang from momentary interests, or they are reflexions on the kaleidoscopic political or ecclesiastical events of his time or answers to controversies raised by contemporary thinkers. "His two greatest philosophic and theological works—the *Nouveaux Essais* and the *Théodicée*—are in their initiation fundamentally only refutations of the sense philosophy of Locke and of the scepticism of Bayle." [1] Works on transient subjects, sometimes of a very local nature, are soon forgotten.

Then there was his desire for anonymity. He was especially desirous to avoid undue religious controversy, and knew the danger in those days of arousing religious passion by introducing the personal factor. If his philosophy was sound from a religious point of view he was nevertheless much too fair to please the narrow partisans of his time or to satisfy any of the Orthodox parties; he was also a layman, and felt that he was intruding on the province of a specialist like Bossuet. Therefore "Leibnitz has published nothing of a theological nature except the *Théodicée* under his own name"; [2] and it was only under compulsion that he allowed the *Théodicée* to go forth as his work. It was entirely against his wish that two letters to Pelisson on Church questions were published as his. We can understand, therefore, that time was needed to collect and establish the identity of the theological works of Leibnitz.

Another peculiar feature, which led to the same result, was the scattered nature of his theological utterances. "It will never be possible to collect the theological works of Leibnitz, somewhat in the same way as his mathematical and political works." [3] The title of a work is an insufficient guide to its contents. An editor would be left with very little for his collection if he followed this rule. Leibnitz loved a free style and was especially addicted to theologising.

[1] Pichler, I. 37. [2] *Ibid.*, 167. [3] *Ibid.*, 166.

Even in his state Annals he allows free course to his thought. Especially does he theologise. Now and then the weightiest remarks are found in treatises and letters where we should not in the least expect them, since the particular subject is often totally otherwise. All the writings of Leibnitz must therefore, without exception, be taken into consideration; even in the mathematical works many interesting theological utterances are found. The historical, statecraft and political, the legal, philological and philosophical works are full of most important expressions for our purpose. It is obvious therefore that some time had to elapse before people could be acquainted with the whole of Leibnitz's theological views. In fact it was not until 1869 that a thorough presentation of the "Theology of Leibnitz" was given to the world by the splendid researches of Dr. A. Pichler.

Another cause of the delay in giving Leibnitz his true place in religious questions is due to the fact that he used the letter-form for the expression of the greater part of his religious opinions. "It was customary at that time," says Rommel, "in the absence of printed newspapers, to communicate information and news of the most different kinds by letter"; [1] but it was more than custom with Leibnitz. The epistolary form suited his temperament. He could wander about from subject to subject like a man conversing in the drawing-room; his ideas could have free course; he could indulge his fondness for repetition and parenthesis; he could satisfy his longing for friendship. The letter-form always remained to him as the most beloved medium for the development of his thought. By this means he embraced the whole world in friendship. His correspondence includes more than a thousand names, among whom are emperors and kings, princes and princesses, the chief representatives of that time in all branches of knowledge, with the first statesmen and generals. He covered the country from London to Pekin and Naples to S. Petersburg with his letters. He did not distinguish between Catholic and Protestant, Jansenist and Jesuit, Lutheran, Reformed and Pietist, Church and State. It is easy to understand, therefore, when we remember how much of his theological and Church opinions was embodied in his letters, why

[1] Rommel, I. 2.

contemporaries could not hope to give him his due in this department of his activities. The spirit of real industry had to possess the minds of several suitable scholars to gather his scattered works from the corners of the earth.

Eckhart was ridiculed when he suggested that there must be bundles of theological treatises and writings from the pen of Leibnitz in the unexplored libraries and studies of the world. Ludovici thought that such works would have come to light in twenty years. But, truth to tell, they were resting without a name to identify them in the libraries of Europe, or they were enclosed in the letter chests of numerous correspondents from whose effects they had to be rescued by the work of patient scholarship. Among those who performed this duty to the theological and Church works of Leibnitz none rank higher than Ludovicus Dutens, a French Swiss; A. Foucher de Careil, a young and devoted French earl; G. E. Guhrauer, a German scholar of Breslau; and Chr. von Rommel, historian and director of the Royal Archives of Hesse. Not until these men had done their work collecting and criticising the religious works of Leibnitz could a true estimate of them be made.

After this somewhat lengthy parenthesis we come back to seek from the work of these scholars what were the chief general characteristics of the relation of Leibnitz to the Churches during his long sojourn at Hanover (1676–1716). Above all else he maintains the spirit of independence which was the characteristic of all his earlier work. He stands above all parties that he might contribute to the salvation of the whole. Of the laymen who had begun to take theology seriously in those days, he was the greatest. And in all of them this spirit of independence was displayed. "The conditions in Germany after the Peace of Westphalia" were such that "the educated laity began to occupy themselves with theology in order to fight the orthodox theologians with their own weapons, and to defend Christendom and the Fatherland against them." [1] Most of them broke with the exclusive spirit of the parties.

Leibnitz boasted of his independence and especially that he was "Autodidakt." [2] This aspect of his theology made a special appeal to Pichler. "The circumstance which

[1] Pichler, I. 118. [2] Guhrauer, I. 20.

made the theology of Leibnitz seem to me to be of especial value," he says, " is that it is the production of buoyant original spirit and contains his own peculiar thought." [1] " Leibnitz is one of those extraordinary men . . . who are an event in themselves, and who at the beginning of new epochs are sent by Providence for the revival of new spiritual life." [2]

His contemporaries accused him of indifference,[3] but, however devoid of emotional feeling through his attempt to see everything from a detached point of view, he was absolutely sincere in his religious intentions. What other verdict could we give to the life of a great man, with a world reputation, who remained to the end of his life an adherent to the Confession of Augsburg when, by yielding very few points of doctrine, he might have received a very high appointment at the Vatican and maybe a Cardinal's hat? He stood firmly for what he believed to the end, suffering the lot of all great independent thinkers, when he was left almost friendless in his last years and buried like a robber, with Eckhart, his secretary, as the only mourner. " The whole Court was invited to follow him to the grave," writes Eckhart, " but apart from me no one else appeared." [4]

One of his noblest characteristics was his attitude to Rome. No man ever went so far to show the good points of the Roman system of order and worship.[5] It was a result of this attempt to stand outside all systems of religion and to discern the good in all which at first won him so many correspondents in every school. The Jesuits praised him; he in turn took the side of the Jesuits in the China controversy. Above all, he was bitter against all who adopted the popular Protestant belief that the Pope was Antichrist.

The greatest example of his independent spirit is found in his own personal religion. Although he always confessed allegiance to the Augsburg Confession, he was far from the literal orthodoxy of the Lutherans of his day. In fact the pettiness of all the orthodoxies had a direct influence on his religious practices. He went to church little, heard few sermons, and for many years did not communicate. Eckhart assures us that during his period as secretary, 1697–

[1] Pichler, I. 5. [2] *Ibid.*, 3. [3] Merz, p. 133.
[4] Guhrauer, *in loco*. [5] Pichler, I. 100.

1716, Leibnitz communicated once only, and that during a stay in Vienna,[1] in a Lutheran church during a time of plague. He may have communicated privately at the hands of his friend Molanus; on the other hand, however, the Landgrave Ernest of Hesse writes to a Catholic prince as follows: "He confessed openly to me . . . that for many years he had not been present at the Lord's Supper or the Communion of the Lutheran Eucharist, but he has not confided the motive for it to me; he even said that all at Court, and even the Lutheran ministers of that country, knew it, and out of respect said nothing to him about it"[2] (27 Nov. 1687). We have therefore to admit that, from the year of his arrival at Hanover and perhaps before that date, he took up a neutral position which lasted throughout his life. He was convinced that this attitude of separation was necessary for the good of the whole Church.

Can we blame him for this? He refused to attend church because he was deeply religious. "The Lutheran Churches quaked under the curses against the Roman Antichrist and his kingdom, and the Jesuit preachers put the Pope on Christ's seat and taught their devout hearers to thank God that they were not as other people, who all belonged to the devil."[3] Leibnitz solved the problem of his religious life by himself; he would work outside the Churches for the unity of the whole. "It is not enough to say that it is the work of the Holy Spirit to touch men's hearts; His influence must be won by a sincere desire to help forward the peace of the Church by all that lies within our power. Those who are not doing this are in real error and they alone are guilty of schism."[4] The narrowness of the Churches was one of the chief factors which directed him to the great work of Reunion on which he embarked soon after arriving in Hanover.

His hatred of pedantry and love of facing practical problems also came to his aid. He was no mere anti-

[1] Pichler, II. 433.

[2] Rommel, II. 107. The religion of Leibnitz was absolutely disinterested. The persuasions of the best Catholics of the day could not change him; neither the offer of a Fellowship in the Paris Academy, nor the allurement of the Librarianship of the Vatican, with the prospect of a Cardinal's hat, made any impression on him. The Emperor offered glowing proposals in vain (Rommel, I. 208).

[3] Pichler, II. 434.

[4] Foucher, I. 436.

quarian. "My aim is," he writes in Nov. 1671 to the Duke John Frederick of Hanover, "not to fill shops with futile books, written in the air, but where possible to provide something of use." [1] This brings us directly to his work for Reunion of the Churches. "The most important of all the practical problems to which Leibnitz devoted himself," says Merz, ". . . was the question of the Reunion of the two Churches. The fact that the Thirty Years' War had ended in a drawn battle, so far as the two religions were concerned; that many intelligent rulers—such as Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels, John Frederick of Hanover, and men of the standing of Boineburg had gone back to the Catholic Faith; the circumstance of Leibnitz's employment in the service of the great Catholic Bishop of Mainz; his friendship with Antoine Arnaud and afterwards with Bossuet—all these will sufficiently account for the interest he took in the great controversy of his age and for the negotiations which he carried on with the object of amalgamating the Creed and Constitution of the two Churches." [2]

The fundamental motive which led him to this great task has been much discussed. It remains for us to consider what was the underlying and deepest motive which induced him to consecrate more than half his life to binding up the wounds of the Church.

Some critics have treated it as the work of a philosopher who has no deep religious feeling, in the sense that the Reunion of the Churches was a problem to be solved. Werner, a celebrated Austrian theologian, expresses this view. According to him the work of Leibnitz was not a religious question pressing on his soul for solution, but merely a "spiritual problem" (geistiges Problem) treated by a philosopher and diplomat rather than by a Christian.[3] It would, however, be difficult to go through the correspondence of Leibnitz with either Bossuet or the Landgrave Ernest and come to that conclusion. His letters burn with a personal enthusiasm, as though religion was his most priceless possession.

Guhrauer, without casting any reflexion on the quality of Leibnitz's motive, finds the origin of the work for the

[1] Guhrauer, *Deutsche Schriften*, I. 274. [2] Merz, pp. 65, 66.
[3] Pichler, I. 188.

Church in his philosophic ideas. It was "not the satisfaction of a religious need but the postulate of a speculative idea, as that contained in his previously developed principles of the laws of the Christian state and people, and which he saw symbolically represented in the hierarchy of the Middle Ages, in the dualism of the Pope and Emperor; this alone inspired Leibnitz in the course of his work for restoring the tie between the Protestants and the head of the Roman Church"; "a personal religious motive was thus hardly present in it." [1] Leibnitz had himself to blame for giving currency to this belief, by emphasising his devotion to his philosophical principles in the face of religious beliefs. Many times he stated that, had he been born within the Catholic Church, he would not have forsaken it, except under the exigency of being driven out on account of his philosophy, and to the Landgrave Ernest he makes his philosophic principles a constant subject of hindrance to his accepting the Roman Faith. But when we come to examine the nature of the evidence on which Guhrauer bases his remarks we are surprised that Leibnitz's biographer should have possessed so little knowledge of the religious documents of an earlier period. He finds the chief expression of this "philosophic idea" in the correspondence with the Landgrave Ernest, in which a distinction is drawn between the inner and outer Communion of the Church. "And since this distinction," he concludes, "goes back to the chief principles of his philosophic system, he was unable to recognise the Roman Church as the exclusive fold of salvation without bringing himself into contradiction with his principles." [2] But is it a fact that this distinction is based on any philosophical principle whatever?

The chief passage in which reference is made to the distinction is found in a letter to the Landgrave Ernest dated from Hanover, Jan. 1684, and is as follows: "I believe that a person may be a member of the Invisible Communion of the Church Catholic without being in the Visible Church; as when a person is unjustly excommunicated by an error or by the malice of the Judge." [3] This is not the product of any philosophical idea, but a legacy from the religious thought of the times of the Great Schism of the West. It has been seen above how closely German thinkers were in

[1] Guhrauer, I. 340 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, 349. [3] Rommel, II. 18.

touch with the events of 1377–1416 [1] and with the Councils of Pisa and Constance, and there is no doubt but that Leibnitz was well versed in the ideas which lay behind those great Councils. His references to the period in the correspondence with Bossuet show that he found delight there. Passages like the following taken from that period will illustrate the idea of a distinction between the inner and outer Communion of the Church, *e.g.* "In this Church universal all the faithful, in so far as they are faithful, are one in Christ, and there is no difference between Jews and Greeks, masters and servants." "The other Church is named Apostolic, particular and individual, and consists of Pope, Cardinals, Bishops and Churchmen." "Therefore these two Churches are distinguished from one another as genus and species; since the whole Apostolic Church is Catholic, but not vice versa." (See other extracts above, all from *De Modis*, Theod. of Niem, von der Hardt, II. p. 68 ff.) It would only multiply examples to show how this idea was frequently reiterated during the Reformation. It seems therefore to be unnecessary to trace this to any principle of the philosophy of Leibnitz.

If an intimate relation is to be traced between the religious and philosophical activities of Leibnitz, there can be no doubt about the result. The religion of Leibnitz is more basic than his philosophy. It is true to say with Bockh that "no sentence of his philosophy is taken from revelation or from positive theology" if reference is made to the special points of Church dogma, but the pre-established harmony could not have been conceived by a mind which was not Christian. "His whole system of the pre-established harmony . . . rests on Christianity . . . and in consequence Leibnitz must not only be reckoned as a Christian philosopher, but the philosophy of Leibnitz must also be reckoned as Christian . . . the pre-established harmony itself lay in the personality of Leibnitz and is only to be completely understood as from him." [2]

The supreme motive which underlies all the efforts of Leibnitz for the good of the whole Church was religious and not merely philosophical. To him religion was the basis of all true knowledge and of all true national greatness.

[1] See p. 3 f. [2] Pichler, I. 204.

"The knowledge of God," he wrote to Bayle (1687), "is no less the principle of the sciences than His Being and His Will are the principles of our own being. Philosophy is sanctified when its streams are represented as running from the fountain of the attributes of God." [1] To the princes of Germany he frequently assumed the style of a preacher. "If the princes of Germany think seriously of their liberty, it is absolutely necessary that they change their methods and determine to follow the maxims which Jesus Christ enjoins for the salvation of souls." [2] The *Confessio naturæ contra Atheistas* is the work of a keenly religious mind.[3] It is therefore to the lasting credit of the French theologians of the middle of the nineteenth century that they supported with all their power the fundamentally religious motive of Leibnitz; even among the Roman Catholics, who might well have been prejudiced against him after the controversy between Leibnitz and the great French Bishop Bossuet. The Catholic Earl Foucher de Careil speaks of him as a "magnificent champion of the things of God, of whose salvation, though he was not a Catholic, there is no doubt." [4] Germany recovered from her false conception of his religious work in the comprehensive work of Dr. A. Pichler. He has vindicated for ever the supremely religious motive which lay behind all this aspect of Leibnitz's efforts and has given the true perspective from which to view the whole work of this versatile scholar and statesman; an undertaking which was impossible until a thorough research had been made into the whole of Leibnitz's theological utterances. The following paragraph is the most characteristic contribution of Pichler on this question. "The exact and ultimate cause for the more than fifty years' ardent endeavour of our Leibnitz for the accomplishment or, at any rate, for the preparation of the Reunion of the separated Churches is to be sought . . . in his own personality. Almost the whole of the hitherto published accounts of Leibnitz's efforts after the Unity of the Church are partial and deficient, since they leave this important point out of view (weil sie diesen wichtigsten Punkt aus dem Auge gelassen). It is, in the first place, not the philosopher, not the historian, not the diplomat, but the

[1] Erdmann, p. 106. *Lettre à Bayle*, 1687.
[2] Foucher, III. 282. [3] Dutens, I. 5.
[4] *Lettre à Lescœur :* Paris, 1852.

sincere religious character, the real Christian and the glowing patriot Leibnitz, who was revealed in the question over the means and ways of attaining a reconciliation of the mutually embittered parties in the Church." [1] With this judgment anyone who has read albeit a portion of the theological works will agree. His work for the Churches sprang from the sincere and spontaneous desire of his own soul.

If there was any other motive behind it, that motive was a great passion for his broken Fatherland. Leibnitz the patriot is like a flame of fire. "Germany," he cries, "is the heart of Europe. Germany has been a scare to all her neighbours; through her disunity France and Spain have become formidable, Holland and Sweden have increased. Germany is the 'fruit of discord' (pomum Eridos), as Greece at first and Italy afterwards . . . Germany is the ball which they who have played for Monarchy have thrown to each other; Germany is the battlefield where men have fought for the hegemony of Europe. In short, Germany will not cease to be the object of bloodshedding from within and without, until she awakes, gathers herself together and becomes united." [2] When France assumed a threatening attitude Leibnitz became a stronger patriot than ever. "After his first journey he did not return again to France." [3] He called the princes to national action. If need be the Emperor must have more power to keep the nation together. "The want of union in the Empire is not that the Emperor has too much power . . . but that the Emperor as Emperor has not enough." [4] He attacked the mimicking of French customs, dress, food, clothes, language, and French vices. He called out for national education, and ridiculed the mania of his nation for bringing wisdom from yon-side the Rhine. But his loudest call was for a National Church. "If the chief motto of Leibnitz ran 'Christianus sum, nil Christiani a me alienum puto,' another is directly and indissolubly connected with it: 'Germanus sum, nil Germani a me alienum puto.'" [5] His deepest religious aims were world-wide. He sought the Reunion of the Church of Rome and the Church of the Reformation, the Reunion of Protestantism and the Eastern Church, but within that larger sphere of effort he had a passionate longing to bring

[1] Pichler, II. 432. [See heading to this chapter.] [2] Klopp, I. 246.
[3] Pichler, I. 9. [4] Foucher, IV. 333. [5] Pichler, I. 108.

to his nation, bruised and broken as it was by division and strife, the glory of one national and united Church. Throughout his work for Reunion therefore his basic motive was deeply personal and religious, but when he was dealing with the Churches within the Fatherland it assumed a new and added warmth. He was then working for an aim beyond the Reunion of the Churches themselves; he was working for the prevention of another strife like the Thirty Years' War; he was working for the Unity of Germany.

CHAPTER III

REUNION OF PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS

"De toutes les méthodes qu'on a proposées pour lever ce grand schisme d'Occident, qui règne encore, et qui a faict tant de préjudice à la chrestienté et causé tant de maux spirituels et temporels je trouve celle que M. l'évesque de Tina, maintenant de Neustadt, a négotiée avec quelques théologiens protestans, la plus raisonnable."

"Of all the methods which have been proposed to remove this great Western Schism, which still continues . . . and which has caused so much damage, temporal and spiritual, to Christianity, I think that the scheme which the Bishop of Tina [now of Neustadt] has negotiated with certain Protestant theologians is the fairest."—FOUCHER, I. p. xvii.

THERE were many precedents for attempting a Reunion of the Protestant and Catholic Churches. The Peace of Westphalia had plucked the sword from the hands of impassioned opponents, who wanted to settle their religious differences by an appeal to force. Henceforward, the only possible method was to be one of explanation and conciliation. Protestantism had established its right to a place in civilisation alongside Catholicism. No one therefore thought of a further recourse to arms as a solution of the religious problem; the majority favoured recourse to argument instead.

From 1648 onwards there is a line of conferences and councils, fixed with the sole object of discussing the way towards the Reunion of the Churches. The general plan was to arrange a conference of strong representatives of each side and then, if any agreement could be reached, to publish a document reconciling the two points of view.

An example of this type of conference, outside the work of Leibnitz, is found in the Conference of Thorn (Collatio Toruniensis), August 1645. It was summoned by the peace-loving Ladislas of Poland. Since the Peace of Sendomir, 1570, both Lutherans and Calvinists had been tolerated in Poland. The King was therefore in a very favourable position for negotiating a Reunion Movement.

Delegates came from each communion to the town of meeting, which lay in the jurisdiction of the Elector of Brandenburg. The Jesuits were of little note; of the Lutherans, Calixtus of Helmstadt, Calovius of Dantzig and Hulsemann of Wittenberg were the most important; Bergius was the chief Calvinist. George Calixtus calls for special mention as he is an example of a new type of mind produced by a reaction against the narrow confessions of the day. "It is George Calixtus who, profiting by his travels, instigates a movement greatly resembling that of Mr. Silas McBee to-day" [1] (see *Constructive Quarterly*). He looked for the victory of truth and of no party creed; he saw clearly the difference between faith and knowledge, between religion and theology. He put the ethical side of Christianity above the credal. A good life and the Apostles' Creed were sufficient for a complete Christian.

It would be useless to follow the Conference through its tortuous negotiations to an inglorious end. The only result was the growth of the Syncretistic Controversy and all the bitterness of feeling which that called forth. People called out: "Behold the followers of Calixtus—they deny the ground and strength of Truth—they are strongly bound in union—but it is a false, untrue, fleshly love, a bond of darkness against God and His Word." [2] But Calixtus, like Leibnitz, was a sign of the times, in his increasing desire to see beyond the sections of Christianity to the whole.

Leibnitz entered into this tradition of conciliation at the Court of Mainz. The Elector was "beloved and esteemed equally by Evangelicals and Catholics" ("evangelicis æque ac catholicis dilectus et æstimatus," Puffendorff, *De rebus Suedicis*, XIX. p. 73). Boineburg saw that the opportunity was at hand for a scheme of Reunion. Hermann Conring, Professor of Divinity at Helmstadt, was in favour of it, and a conference was arranged between the Theological Faculty at Helmstadt and the Chapter at Mainz "with the view of bridging, or at least of narrowing down, the chasm" which separated the two Churches. Conring would not admit the Papal supremacy in spite of the arguments of the celebrated brothers Adrian and Peter von Walenburch, who took the Catholic side. Schröckh the

[1] Bouquet, A. C., *Introduction to the Study of Christian Reunion*, p. 161.
[2] Hagenbach, p. 152.

Lutheran theologian gives eighteen Articles as the result of the Conference, which are said to have been communicated to the Pope by M. von Wallendorf, the Vicar-General and Privy Councillor of the Elector.

Much discussion has been given to the question of the genuineness of these articles. Most German and Protestant historians think that they were the terms on which the Lutherans were to be admitted into the Church. Some say that they received the formal sanction of the Pope. But Guhrauer (in *Deutsche Schriften*, I. p. 23 ff.) has shown that the Articles attributed to the Elector are fictitious. Boineburg tells Conring that they are "an idle popular rumour," and Leibnitz in a letter to Fabricius, Jan. 22, 1700, assures his correspondent that they are an invention of the times (cp. Gruber's *Commercium Leibnit*, I. pp. 411, 426). The Articles may be seen in Russell's edition of the *Systema* (Introd.).

Mainz was a good preparation for Hanover. Leibnitz had imbibed there the larger spirit of the Gallican Church, to the principles of which the Elector Archbishop and Boineburg held with great tenacity; and the larger spirit of Protestantism as represented by the theologians of Helmstadt.

With such an experience behind him Leibnitz was well fitted to take his part in the efforts for Reunion at the Court of Hanover. Almost immediately after his arrival there, the religious problem took the ascendency. A Spanish Franciscan, Christopher Rojas (Roxas) de Spinola, Titular Bishop of Tina (Croatia) and afterwards (1686) Bishop of Neustadt, visited the Court in the name of the Emperor and apparently with the full consent of the Pope. He had been previously employed by Philip IV on a diplomatic mission to Vienna, Ratisbon and other cities, and had settled in Vienna as confessor to the Spanish Princess Margaret Theresa on her marriage with Leopold. The Emperor and the Empress placed implicit confidence in him. As Bishop of Tina he made great headway against Protestantism by his wise tolerance. He was a good theologian and well versed in matters of religious controversy. His piety was genuine and his temperament splendidly adapted to the work of conciliating Protestant bitterness.

After a mission in Hungary he made a tour of the German

Courts and arrived at the Court of Hanover in 1677, apparently about the same time as Leibnitz himself. Until the publication of Foucher's works, the historians were hopelessly wrong in the chronology of Spinola's first visit. Guhrauer thought that he had corrected the mistakes of J. K. F. Schlegel [1] (*Kirchengeschichte der Hannov. Staaten*, III. pp. 299–320), and the best historians followed him without further question. The date of Spinola's first visit was fixed as 1679 (June and July). But twenty years after Guhrauer's investigations there appeared in Foucher's first volume "A Summary of the Religious Negotiations." [2] It is in the hand of Leibnitz, and is said to have been "drafted by Spinola" himself. The document shows that Spinola has been engaged in Germany on negotiations for "the peace of the Churches" since 1661. Albritius, the Nuncio at Vienna, was keenly interested in the negotiations; he in turn secured the interest of the Emperor. A vital passage follows: "The Emperor . . . sent delegates to all the Protestant princes of Saxony. . . . He and the Nuncio recommended Spinola to the Duke of Hanover" (1676). In 1677 the Pope's permission is obtained, and an "Apostolic Brief" is given. "The Pope assured the Bishop of his special patronage. The Emperor wrote to the Pope that he expected great results from this affair." Apparently there was a respite towards the end of 1677, because the following notice appears under 17 April, 1678: "The Emperor sent the Bishop again to the German princes. . . . Arms and a permanent body of soldiers were to be sent in advance, under whose protection the sacred business would find shelter." [3]

Copies of the Imperial and Papal letters, which Spinola carried, are still extant. They seem to have been granted on several distinct occasions, as the Imperial letter printed among Bossuet's works is dated 1691, and refers to work in Hungary and Transylvania. "We give by these presents to the Bp. of Neustadt," writes the Emperor, "full power in all matters touching our authority and royal protection and

[1] *Anmerkungen*, II. 5.

[2] Foucher, I. 5 (2nd edit.). N.B. Foucher realises the importance of the newly discovered "Irenica" for the right understanding of the religious aspect of Leibnitz's activities, and especially in relation to the work of Spinola, I. xvii. ff.

[3] Foucher, I. 5–10.

a general Commission from ourselves, to negotiate with all the provinces, towns or individuals of the Protestant religion in all our kingdoms and countries . . . concerning the said Reunion in matters of Faith and the abolition or diminution of unnecessary controversies, whether immediately or by deputies or letter, and to do everything he shall consider suitable and useful in . . . obtaining this holy aim of Reunion. Given at Vienna 20 March, 1691." [1]

A Papal brief dated April 20th, 1678, is preserved by Foucher. It is written directly to the Duke John Frederick (Innocentius PP. XI, dilecto filio nobili viro Joanni-Frederico, duci Brunsvicensi et Luneburgensi) [2] and is of considerable critical importance. Spinola has been engaged on the work of Reunion at the Court of Hanover before the date of this letter, because, in his journey through Germany for the cause of religion, "he has already experienced the rich fruit of the patronage" of the Duke. He is about to return to the task and "places special confidence in the person and power of the Duke for a successful issue to his work." The rest of the letter commends Spinola and the work of Reunion to the Duke.

The Elector of Hanover, John Frederick, himself a convert to Rome, had prepared the way for Spinola by drawing round him the best men of both parties. Among the Catholic theologians were Nicholas Steno, Bishop of Tripolis (*d.* 1686), Father Dionysius, a Capuchin author of a well-known contemporary work (*Via Pacis*), and a certain Baron von Reck, with whom Leibnitz had frequent discussions. On the Lutheran side were Leibnitz himself and Gerhard Walter Molanus, Abbot of Lockum, one of the most capable men of his day. Molanus had been a pupil of George Calixtus at Helmstadt, and became Professor of Theology and Mathematics there at an early age. In 1677 he was appointed Abbot of Lockum and Director of the Church or Consistories of the States of Hanover by John Frederick. He was the trusted companion of Leibnitz throughout the Peace negotiations.

The general terms which Spinola brought to the Protestants of Hanover have been accurately summarised by Rommel. "He (Spinola) relied on the promise of the Reformation princes of the year 1530 to submit to the

[1] *Œuvres de Bossuet*, XVII. 359 ff. [2] Foucher, I. 57.

judgment of a general Council, which Charles V had promised. . . . He hoped to obtain from the Pope, through the Emperor, the erstwhile suspension of the Council of Trent, so that the Protestants who showed their goodwill and filial obedience to the Head of the Catholic Church should no longer be treated as heretics and schismatics, but as visible members of the Catholic Church and fellow voters and judges in the new Council." [1]

Leibnitz rejoiced at the terms. "So propitious do circumstances appear to me," he wrote to Huet (Aug. 1679), "that I almost hope to see a union effected, at once honourable for the Roman Church and not oppressive for the other party. And that judgment I do not make without reason. . . . In no part of Germany is religious controversy conducted with such moderation as in the territory of Brunswick–Luneburg. And since the princes who now rule are excelled by no one in wisdom . . . we are bound, I think, . . . to accuse of indifference or of want of will those who have charge of the government of the Church for any failure. Now at a time like the present, when I hear Pope Innocent praised for his holiness of life and for his eminent zeal and wisdom, I feel my hope rise once more. And when to this I add the fervent piety of the Emperor and the distinguished virtue of the great King (Louis XIV), I am convinced either that some result must soon be attained or that, if this opportunity passes away out of our hands, the object to which so many look forward with exultation must be deferred for centuries yet to come." "Therefore I hope that you will join your projects with those of the great Bishop of Condam." [2]

Leibnitz followed the advice which he had given to Huet; he turned to Bossuet. The experience at Mainz and the example of Boineburg and the Elector made him turn instinctively to the Gallican Church for help. He sent a letter to Bossuet with the request that the King should be won over to the project for Reunion. Bossuet answered in words to which Leibnitz often referred: "King Louis XIV, far from offering any opposition, would relish and favour these ideas" (goûterait ces pensées).[3]

Difficulties arose almost at once. The Summary of the negotiations contains no reference to the years 1678–1682.

[1] Rommel, I. 227. [2] Guhrauer, I. 362, 363. [3] *Ibid.*, 362.

Plague brought an end to the negotiations. Furthermore the Duke John Frederick was unable to continue his zealous work owing to ill health. He thought of following a retired life. But before plans could be arranged he was carried off by the plague. He had left Hanover on 16 Nov. 1679, on a journey to Italy; his business affairs were in such order "as though he were about to lay down the government at once." [His wife and the princesses had gone to Paris to visit relatives.] "Having reached Augsburg, where the Duke and his retinue were to await the security or passport of the Republic of Venice, since every approach to Italy was barred on account of the outbreak of plague, he was overtaken by illness on the third day after his arrival and carried off on Dec. 18th at the age of 55 years." [1] His brother Ernest Augustus, Bishop of Osnabrück, hastened from Venice where he was staying and took up the work which John Frederick had so ably undertaken for the cause of the Reunion of the Churches.

The new Elector was a tolerant Lutheran in religion. The Duchess (Sophia), who comes more prominently into view during the correspondence of Leibnitz with Bossuet, was a Calvinist and attended her own service in the Castle chapel. Both of them refused every offer from the Roman Church. The religion of the Duke was of a very practical sort. Gourville in his *Memoirs* quotes one of his characteristic sayings about the Holy Communion. "The Lord did not want to allow a decisive and conclusive opinion on the meaning of the Lord's Supper . . . otherwise He would have explained Himself on this point with more decision and definition." The bright and gentle Duchess was one of the cleverest women in Europe; she wrote elegant Latin and spoke most living languages. Chevreau, a Frenchman, who knew many European Courts and who had stayed long periods at Hanover, declared that "France possesses no more beautiful spirit than the Duchess of Hanover." Leibnitz was among her closest friends. On Nov. 5, 1701, she acknowledged that "she wrote to him only for the sake of getting letters from him." Their correspondence shows the depth of her mind. In her political schemes Leibnitz was always at her side. And in the work of Reunion she was always to the fore; her womanhood was consecrated to it;

[1] Guhrauer, I. 364.

as she used to say, "since Christianity came into the world through the instrumentality of a woman, so would it be a glorious thing for her if Reunion came through the same channel." [1] In the Court of Hanover, therefore, the Reunion Movement was aflame.

Religious developments in France filled the Court of Hanover with new hope. On the 9th of Nov. 1681, Bossuet preached his great sermon at the opening of the General Assembly of Clergy in the Church of the Grands-Augustins. He announced his faith in the indefectibility of the Papacy, while emphasising the dangers of Ultramontanism. "I say that the Roman See is indefectible," he asserts, "but at the same time I utterly reject the fictitious infallibility of the Ultramontanes." The vast power of the Popes must be exercised with humility and condescension. "They should learn from the example of Peter to listen to the voice of their subordinates, when, though far inferior to S. Paul both in position and in wisdom, they address them with the same object, namely that of restoring peace to the Church. Humility is the most indispensable ornament of exalted rank; there is something more worthy of respect in modesty than in all other gifts; the world is better disposed to submit when he who demands submission is the first to yield to sound reason; and Peter in amending his error is greater, if that be possible, than Paul, who reprehends it."

On March 19th, 1682, the Assembly passed the four famous Declarations, which Bossuet himself had no doubt drawn up. It would be difficult to imagine a more propitious event for the awakening of the spirit of Reunion in the Court of Hanover, just at the time when the chief negotiators were awaiting the second visit of Spinola.

Molanus was still President of the Consistory. The University of Helmstadt was more than ever the cradle of syncretism, and was working professedly for the object of putting away all doctrinal differences between Christians; so much so that one of the conditions for a theological degree was an oath to use every legitimate effort to put an end to prevailing controversies in religion. Frederick Ulric Calixtus, the son of George Calixtus, held the Chair in Theology, and was to take an active part in the

[1] Guhrauer, II. 16, 17 ff.

movement for Reunion. Meyer, another professor, also was interested.

Meanwhile Spinola had set out on another visit to the Courts of Germany. He had met with little success before his arrival at Hanover. Spener declared himself against the scheme after an interview at Frankfort-on-Main. Saxony and Berlin refused also. "Enlightened men had long since seen," says Menzel in his somewhat exaggerated account of the opposition to Spinola, "that the Pope and his followers had perverted religion and usurped a tyrannical control over the Church. Every previous attempt at unity had failed; and the persecutions which the Evangelical Party were at that time suffering from the Catholics in France was an evidence how little reliance could be placed on their written word or on their verbal promises of peace. As long as the Catholics taught and held that the Roman Church could never err, that the Pope was infallible in the explanation of Scripture and in the decision of religious controversies, and that it was competent to him to set aside by a Bull all that private divines taught, wrote or circulated—so long must all the measures proposed from time to time by the Papal theologians be fruitless and ineffective." [1] The Bishop himself had the misfortune to be confined to his bed with a stubborn attack of sciatica; he had to be carried round the Courts in a sedan chair.[2]

In contrast to many other Courts, Hanover gave Spinola a great welcome. The influence of the Duke and Duchess—who was in close touch with Gallicanism through her sister Louise-Hollandine, Abbess of Maubuisson—and the liberal spirit of Leibnitz and the professors of Helmstadt cheered the depressed outlook of the sick Bishop. Leibnitz sent him a letter of welcome, without date, but which must fall soon after the elevation of Bossuet to the See of Meaux (1681). "I hope that your health will improve daily and be perfectly restored," he writes. "Nor do I doubt but that the proposed negotiations will be carried out to the best of your knowledge; for your plans appear to me to be full of sincerity and devotion." [3]

The Duke summoned representatives to meet Spinola at his royal residence. He nominated Molanus and his

[1] Menzel, IX. 268, 269, 278. [2] Foucher, I. 11. [3] *Ibid.*, 76, 77.

Court Preacher, Hermann Barckhausen, along with Calixtus the younger and Meyer, to meet Spinola. "Molanus was the soul of this conference, and, what is to be wondered at, they were quickly unanimous." [1] On March 30, 1683, Molanus presented a project of Reunion to Spinola under the title "Methodus reducendæ Unionis Ecclesiasticæ inter Romanenses et Protestantes." It was the most liberal offer to the Church of Rome in the history of Irenics. Leibnitz, in a letter to Seckendorf (1684), declares that the Protestants did not merely regard the position of the Papacy as one of order but also as one of jurisdiction. For the time being, parties were to refrain from reciprocal condemnation until a General Council was held in which Protestant superintendents should take part as bishops. The "Methodus" was given under the signatures of Molanus and of Barckhausen, and was delivered to the Duke, who in turn passed it on to the Bishop.

Some opposition was discovered among the Protestants when the plan was made known. Calixtus could not agree to the whole of it, in spite of the attempt of the Duke to persuade him. Calixtus was called upon to give his own views in the presence of the Duke. A new document, or rather a revision of the old one, was found to meet all points of view in the Protestant party. It came out towards the end of the year 1683, but was not published until 1691, with the title "Regulæ circa Christianorum omnium ecclesiasticam unionem." This document is the basis of the whole movement for Reunion.

Before turning to its details, it is necessary to face a critical problem. What were the terms which Spinola brought with him to Hanover, and what is his relation to the Regulæ? Schlegel said that he had examined the archives of Hanover in vain for Spinola's original proposals. The "secret history" of them could only be written by Spinola himself, and he is silent on the subject. We are entirely dependent on Protestants for our information, until Vienna and the Vatican have been searched; nothing seems to have been left in Hanover. Guhrauer summarises the views of the Lutherans on the many points which were conceded on doctrine, discipline and Church order. Spinola would yield in giving the chalice to the laity; saint worship and

[1] Guhrauer, II. 21.

good works were to be explained in such terms as would not detract from the honour due to God and to the merits of Christ's death; Protestants were to retain their practices which tend to edification; their ministers were to be at liberty to marry, even a second time; the clergy of each party were to preach and catechise in turn under the names of "Old Catholics" and "New Catholics"; the Eucharist was to be received occasionally at each other's hands in token of intercommunion; the Council of Trent and its anathemas were to be in abeyance until the meeting of a new General Council; the Protestants were to appear and to vote by their superintendents; the Pope would release all Protestants from the name of "heretics" by a formal Bull, and they in turn would declare that they did not regard him as Antichrist, but as the first Patriarch of Christendom.[1]

A striking corroboration of this summary is found in the letter of welcome from Leibnitz to Spinola. Its date is all-important because it proves that these concessions are not the result of the "Regulæ" (late 1683), but those which Spinola brought with him to Hanover. The letter is one of welcome and must therefore be dated earlier than the "Regulæ," and a reply to it bears the date 2 March, 1683. The concessions contained in it are not prejudiced by the concessions established by the "Hauptdokument" of the plans for Reunion. The central passage is as follows: "It has been clearly shown by you that a person may be said to be in the Church without giving assent to all dogmas, which have been there defined. . . . Therefore since Protestants seem to have doubts about the form of the Council of Trent it is sufficient that they submit *ex animo* to the decrees of some future Council, legitimately held; that meanwhile they be received into the Union of the Church; that they receive Holy Orders from the Roman Church. . . . Meanwhile also they have desired the marriage of priests on the example of the Greeks and of the Ancient Church, also to retain communion under both kinds and Divine worship in the vernacular, and to disagree about the manner of the Real Presence in the Communion and about purgatory and other controversies . . . until definition is made in the Council. . . . They themselves may sit as judges in the

[1] Guhrauer, II. 20 f.

Council, etc." [1] Leibnitz seems to have known what was in the mind of Spinola.

Of the relation of Spinola to the "Regulæ" there are conflicting opinions. One edition of Bossuet's works puts them down to the mind of Molanus.[2] But this would be extreme in view of the conference and revision of the theologians of Hanover. Foucher takes the opposite extreme, that they belong to Spinola, Bishop of Tina.[3] Again there is no doubt that whatever terms were brought by Spinola they would have some considerable influence on the resultant document; but it would be a foolish error to assert that the "Regulæ" are throughout the work of Spinola, when it is obvious that they form the background of the Reunion plans, put forward by Leibnitz and Molanus at this time [4] (cf. "Cogitationes Privatæ" in Appendix, p. 225 ff.). The "Regulæ" were therefore the compromise made by the theologians of Hanover, among whom Molanus was chief, with the terms which Spinola brought with him.

The "Regulæ" are so important that an outline of their main articles is indispensable to a right understanding of the chief religious controversies between Catholics and Protestants at that time. There was also a French translation for the benefit of the Gallican Church, which had just reproclaimed its liberties.[5] The whole document thrills with a passionate belief, that in the light of events in France and of the great concessions made by Spinola, Reunion was at the very doors.

The title illustrates the extent of the ground covered by the document. It lays down principles before it faces facts. It proposes a series of "rules" rather than a manual of dogma or worship or order. And these rules are for the "Interim" before the real work is done by the future Council of Catholics and Protestants. Nevertheless, the editor of Bossuet's works has struck the right note in placing them at the head of his "Collection of essays and letters connected with a plan of Reunion between German Protestants and the Catholic Church"; [6] and his reason for doing so is

[1] Foucher, I. 77. [2] *Ibid.*, xxvi. [3] *Ibid.*, I. xxvi.

[4] The rest of the title in Bossuet's *Œuvres*, XVII. 360, is "tam a sacra scripta, quam ab universali ecclesia, et Augustana confessione præscriptæ et a nonnullis, iisque professoribus, zelo pacis collectæ, cunctorumque (scilicet Hanoveriæ) Christianorum correctione ac pietati subjectæ."

[5] Bossuet, *Œuvres*, XVII. 375 ff. [6] *Ibid.*, 375.

sound; they are "the occasion of all that Bossuet and his celebrated opponents wrote afterwards on the project of Reunion, and, besides, the Abbot Molanus follows step by step in his 'Cogitationes Privatæ' the principles given in this work."

Rule 1. The opening sentence strikes the note of hope.[1] "This general Reunion is possible; spiritual and temporal benefits will follow; so that every Christian is bound to give his help as far as lies within his power and in accordance with the laws of God and man and of those of the Diets of the Empire. Those who proclaim the opposite must be treated as heretics and as traitors."

Rule 2. "No truth is to be denied and no means of investigation to be neglected on the way to Reunion. Peace and truth go hand in hand."

Rule 3. "It is not necessary, nor expedient, nor permissible to disclose every article of truth to the opposite party and to bind them explicitly and expressly to renounce every error." The Apostles worked for the Reunion of Jews and Gentiles, but they did not venture to disclose all the errors of the Jews. The Councils of Lyons and of Florence, in which a scheme for Reunion with the Greeks was made, did not demand that the bishops of either party should renounce publicly their ancient doctrinal errors. To disclose all errors would lead to chaos. The public would be scandalised to think that there was so little stability in matters of doctrine.

Rule 4. "In order to arrive at Reunion, the two parties must agree implicitly on all the Articles, revealed and defined; that is to say they must make an express agreement to submit to the same rules of faith and to the same final judge of controversies." "If anyone asks what are the rules and who is the judge, I reply that the internal guidance and determination of the Holy Spirit and the external Word of God are the first rule, and the second rule is the interpretation of that Word as given by the Universal Church."

Rule 5. "It is necessary to agree expressly on points of doctrine and of practice which . . . might detract from the merits of Jesus Christ and from the sacrifice of the Cross." The rule to be followed in this regard is that of the Decree

[1] Bossuet, *Œuvres*, XVII. 360 ff.

of the Ministers of Charenton, 1633, which is reported by Daillé in his "Apologie," *c.* 7–35; and in which it was decided as a general rule that it is not necessary to consider as capital errors those which do not attack formally, directly and immediately either the substance or the attributes of Jesus Christ and those which are not opposed to piety, charity and to the honour due to God. Also, as soon as a doctrine appears to be idolatrous or to derogate from the honour due to God alone, it must be abrogated immediately by a public declaration. Also it is necessary to remember that there are two kinds of religious worship, the one to God Himself, the other for God's sake, to his servants and to sacred things. Even Luther admits that "a king, a teacher, a preacher are men to whom God desires us to render religious dues, although we do not attribute divinity to them." And Calvin says, "I say the same thing of all those things which serve as the outer form of religion, as the holy books, the chalice, etc." But it is unnecessary to follow the extreme superstition of the Roman Catholics.

These considerations make a way for peace in several directions. The best Protestants tolerate those who teach that although "man has no merit of his own in the work of justification yet he is worthy, in some way, of the 'increase,' or, to use their own expression, the 'second degree of glory.'" They take a more extended sense of the word "merit," so that if the Catholics agree with them on this matter the question can be regarded as one of words and relegated to the schools.

The English Protestants and all those of Poland and other countries which follow the Helvetic Confession fall on their knees before the Eucharistic Bread and receive it in this posture. They are tolerated in spite of this posture and no one accuses them of idolatry, because on all occasions they protest that their worship is addressed directly to Jesus Christ and not to the Bread. If the Catholics will say the same thing they will likewise be tolerated. Let them avoid all suspicion of idolatry; then their error on the "permanence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist" may be as easily tolerated as that of "our brethren the Ubiquitaries," who believe that the Body of Jesus Christ is present everywhere.

The other Roman Catholic errors on transubstantiation and on the Eucharistic accidents will deserve to be tolerated

according to the above rules, provided they reject idolatry in the sense described; for Luther himself believed "that these errors are to be tolerated and that the questions raised on this subject are mere sophistry." Lutherans even have images, but are careful to attribute no virtue to them; they are used merely to raise the mind to spiritual things, which the images represent. If Roman Catholics explain their position in this way they will be tolerated.

Prayers for the dead and invocation of the saints are tolerated in the Ancient Fathers, in the modern Greeks and in other orthodox circles, because they avoid the error of saying that the Cross was not a sufficient sacrifice and because they do not render final worship to the saints. If the Roman Catholics would explain themselves in the same way they would be tolerated.

Again, the Masses in use among the Lutherans are allowable because, although they employ the same ornaments, recite almost the same prayers and observe the same ceremonies as the Roman Church, (1) they do not believe that Jesus Christ is truly, really and physically sacrificed or put to death by the actual separation of His Body and Blood, (2) they teach that Jesus Christ made full satisfaction for sin on the Cross. There is therefore no other operation in the Eucharist but the Presence of Jesus Christ, eaten really and truly in memory of the sacrifice of the Cross, which it represents, and the giving of thanks for that sacrifice. It is also true to say that while Jesus Christ prays to His Father for us at all times, He prays especially for those who receive Him in Communion with a lively faith, and presents to His Father at that time the merits of His Passion. The priest who places his trust with a lively faith in the mercies of Christ, in offering the Holy Mysteries, presents in a special way to God the merits of the sacrifice of Christ, as well for himself as for the whole people.

Rule 6. It is necessary to find a common basis of Communion so that it will not be mortal sin for one party to communicate with the other.

Rule 7. "It is necessary to agree on some form of Church government and to establish it in such a manner that all tyranny over conscience or person is done away."

Roman Catholics and Protestants agree that General Councils are necessary to avoid diverse opinions of individuals,

but Christian States are divided among so many sovereigns that the practical difficulties of calling a Council are insuperable. The bishops of France and Spain would not attend a Council called by the princes of Germany nor vice versa. And the Roman States believe that a Council summoned without the authority of the Pope is null and void, and they would reject all ways but their own. Here, however, is the form of government received everywhere alike—pastors are placed under bishops, bishops under archbishops, archbishops under the five Patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. "Among the Patriarchs, he of Rome is head or chief, although this prerogative is given to him only by human law." This supremacy has never been rejected by the Protestants neither in the Confession of Augsburg nor in the "Apology"; they only detest its abuse, in its tyranny over conscience and person. Although Papal infallibility is not admitted, the opinion of the Pope on all matters not determined by Holy Scripture or by the Church should have preference. However, his sentences cannot be published in the respective States without the consent of the Prince.

Rule 8. Agreement must be made on the subject of customs or ecclesiastical practices which cannot be omitted or introduced without disturbing the peace of the Church or of society. The Apostles accepted some Jewish customs which they dare not abolish; S. Paul circumcised Timothy. In the last century in a certain canton of Carinthia there was an instance of the need of care in this matter. The lord of the district set up a minister to instruct his vassals. Being of the Helvetic Confession this pastor showed his congregation the errors of the Roman Church. But a day arrived when it was customary to have a procession to the Church. The minister did all he could to get the people to abolish it; but his persuasions only irritated them. They determined to kill their lord if he did not give them another minister who would observe the procession.

Protestants will not endure the withdrawal of the chalice, the establishment of celibacy as a law, and the obligation to certain practices which have always appeared idolatrous to them. On the other hand, Catholics will not endure an immediate abolition of their forms of prayer, liturgy and ceremonies; nor will they be obliged to receive the Sacra-

ment from the hands of a priest whom they deem to be of doubtful Orders.

Rule 9. It is necessary to agree to abstain from public discussion of all the other points of doctrinal controversy. Nothing but scandal would otherwise accrue. Such matters as Transubstantiation, the permanent Presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, Communion in one kind, the infallibility of the Council of Trent, the supreme authority of the Pope by Divine Law, should be remitted to the judgment of a future Council, and the Protestants must pledge themselves to accept the decisions of the Council on these matters. As soon as the Protestants are disposed to give to the Pope and the Council a reasonable obedience, then Roman Catholics must no longer treat them as schismatics; on the other hand, Protestants must be prepared to abstain from charging Roman Catholics with idolatry, heresy and fundamental errors. A special precaution is needed that these matters should not be brought before the public before the date of the Council; they should only be discussed in Council and Conference and by wise and discreet persons.

Rule 10. "It is absolutely necessary to the princes, ecclesiastical and secular, of both sides . . . in a word to the laity of whatever position they may be, the status, rights and rewards which they have enjoyed in the past and of which they are yet in possession, provided that these be not contrary to divine law and that they may be retained in good faith and that they are to be rightly employed." Greater temporal advantages will result when all desire Reunion. The people of each party will enjoy a complete peace with their fellow citizens. "Up to the present the schism of the Churches has often been the cause of one party vilifying another and then of betraying each other to foreigners." The Protestant nobility will by the Reunion be able to possess many prebends and ecclesiastical offices. Protestant ministers will have the door opened to them and to their children of innumerable benefices and prelacies. (The morality of distant offices seemed to be justifiable in that age.) The Roman Catholics will certainly lose part of their temporal goods, since they will be obliged to share the benefices and ecclesiastical offices with the Protestants, but as a reward their Patriarch will recover his ancient

authority by the submission of those who were once his children.

It remains now only to agree on fundamental rules of Faith. The Holy Spirit is the internal guide; the Word of God the external guide. A third and inferior rule is "the interpretation of Scripture adopted by common consent or authorised by the practice of the Church, ancient and modern, including the five Patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, or which will be approved of by a new Œcumenical Council."

All Christians are agreed on the following points:—Such Councils are not always necessary, but only in certain circumstances, when the peace of the Church cannot otherwise be set up. The interpretation of Scripture in the Council must be preferred to any particular or private interpretation, otherwise there would be as many religions as parishes if each held to his own private interpretation. We are also agreed that General Councils have often erred. Their œcumenicity depends on "the subsequent consent of the majority of the Church, to which the help of the Holy Ghost is promised. Nevertheless, when a Council has worked on legitimate lines we must suppose that it has the consent of the Church, and every good Christian must say to himself after the decisions of a Council have been given, 'It is true that my pastors may be wrong, but I may also be wrong; and since in things which concern salvation and eternal truth it is better to follow the surest part, I ought to bring myself into line with the interpretation of my pastors, because Jesus Christ has promised to be found in the midst of those who assemble in His Name.'"

The conditions under which a General Council meets should be the same as those of the Councils of the first four centuries. These conditions are:—All the bishops of the Christian world were convoked, and they alone made decisions with the authority of judges. But we find among the judges other persons who took an equal rank with the bishops (chorepiscopi),[1] such as "the chief Protestant theologians, who shall have worked efficaciously in the work of Reunion." Numbers and nations don't count in a General Council. There were only a few Latin bishops

[1] The Editor says that chorepiscopi were only priests like modern Rural Deans and never had a deliberative vote in the Council.

at the first Council of Nicæa, but this did not prevent its being regarded as œcumenical. It is sufficient that all the bishops be convoked. The majority will decide.

Those who opposed the decrees were regarded as heretics and excommunicate. Each member of the Council took an oath to speak sincerely and freely. All the Church will pray for the Council,[1] since it is not numbers nor the knowledge of those who attend which make it infallible but the presence of Jesus Christ.

One last warning is given. It would be a shameful tyranny of which antiquity knows nothing to wish that one nation should be equal in number and authority to all the other Christian nations at the Council. This is the final word; and it was no doubt intended to prevent what Protestants felt was a great injustice at the Council of Trent, where the Italians and Spaniards were said to have been given an unjust predominance.[2]

In 1684 Spinola left Hanover with the document described above. He remained for a short time at the Courts of Hessen-Darmstadt, Saxony, Durlach, Würtemberg, where he met with a cold reception.[3] He submitted the opinions contained in the "Regulæ" to each Court, but received little encouragement from Protestant theologians. At last he reached Rome. Innocent XI, a wise and tolerant Pope, called a congregation of cardinals and generals of different Orders to discuss the terms of agreement.[4] The meeting is described in a work in the autograph of Leibnitz, and entitled *Leibnitii Relatio de Christofori Rojas Hispani Conatibus, circa uniendam Christianam Religionem.* Among those present was Father Noyelles, the General of the Jesuits and "Magister sacri palatii"; a discussion took place and the opinion of the Emperor was obtained. "The Pope," writes Leibnitz, "conferred with some of the cardinals and other ecclesi-

[1] Several times reference is made to later treatment of a subject, but this treatment does not occur. This seems to point to the fact that the work is an abridgment of the real document.

[2] Further research is necessary on this remarkable document. There are gaps in it which need to be explained.

[3] Schlegel, III. 304–307.

[4] Russell says that the Papal approval did not extend to the details of Spinola's plan, but was only a very general approval of his work, p. lxxxvii; but see *Correspondence with Landgrave Ernest*, pp. 124, 125.

astics, and they concluded that the propositions made to the Protestants, although they would tend to detract from the authority of the Council of Trent, yet were not without precedent, having been already, indeed in part (as regards the chalice and the marriage of priests), conceded to the Greeks in the union which took place at Florence. Nevertheless, that considering the present rupture with the French Court and Church, and their disposition to represent all the Pope's proceedings in the worst light, it was not advisable as yet to make any actual concessions to the Protestants; that hopes might be held out to them, however, and that as several Protestant theologians had refused to communicate with Mgr. Spinola because he had no authority from the Pope,[1] but only from the Emperor, he should be invested with powers to that effect." [2] In the "Sommaire" there is a sidelight on this subject: "Charles Noyelles, General of the Society of Jesus, wrote, 11 Nov. 1684, to the Bishop at Vienna [also 19 Aug. 1684]. He said that the matter had been examined and approved by Peter Marino, General of the Minors of the Altar of Heaven, 20 Aug. 1684." [3] And a letter from Leibnitz to Madame Brinon, 29 Sept. 1691, sums up the whole matter: "The hand of God is not shortened," he writes, "the Emperor is favourable to the project; Pope Innocent XI and many cardinals, generals of Orders, the 'Magister sacri Palatii' and some notable theologians . . . have given a very favourable explanation. I have myself seen the letter of the late R. P. Noyelles in the original." [4] Spinola returned to Vienna at the end of 1684 and communicated his experience to Hanover and elsewhere.

During these interesting and important discussions at the Court of Hanover, nothing has been mentioned of the share of Leibnitz in them. As librarian and councillor to the Court he had no official position in either of the Churches, and was not entitled to take part in the formal meetings for discussion; but of his keen interest and of the general trend of his thought there can be no doubt. He has delivered them to posterity in two little-known works: (1) *Des Méthodes de Réunion*, and (2) *Relation pour la Cour Impériale*. These works are of vital value in estimating the mind of Leibnitz in connection with Spinola's mission; and, because he had

[1] The Papal Brief mentioned above was only for Hanover.
[2] Menzel, *in loco*. [3] Foucher, I. 13. [4] Dutens, I. 519.

not seen them, Guhrauer fell into hopeless errors at this point of his Biography. A summary of the two works will serve the double purpose of making the treatises known and of clarifying the relation of Leibnitz to the work of the Bishop of Tina.

The *Relation pour la Cour Impériale* [1] places the negotiations of Spinola in their true historical perspective. History demands the re-establishment of a United Church; history teaches the difficulty of the task. "Since so many futile attempts have been made by arms, by wrangling and by gentle methods, which have always proved a failure, the matter has seemed hopeless to many people, as if the hand of God alone and the passage of time could bring a remedy." [2] The parties have stood with swords drawn; they have treated each other as "heretics, idolators, excommunicate, and lost." "Germany has been inundated with blood, not to speak of other countries in Europe; the murders, acts of arson, pillaging, sacrilege, violence and of other frightful evils have been innumerable, but the greatest evil has been the loss of so many souls, purchased by the blood of Christ, as a result of these disturbances." Religious conferences of the past century, like that of Ratisbon, between learned Jesuits and Protestant doctors of theology, have occupied many weeks of work without bearing any fruit. They have rather increased the evil. "The Pope was even regarded as Antichrist and Rome as Babylon. Whoever opened his mouth in praise of moderation was considered a syncretist and became suspect of apostasy." "After the general Peace was concluded at Münster and Osnabrück (Westphalia) the two parties . . . began to take up a more moderate attitude and to give at least some hope of toleration." "But . . . this Peace was like a species of truce which has sprung from general weariness"; there was fire under the cinders, and from time to time the flames broke out. There are sufficient recent examples to prove that religious divisions were used to inflame the political divisions of the Empire and in the interest of worldly ends.

It is the duty of those in authority, but "especially that of the chief princes and above all of the Emperor, the temporal head and advocate of the Universal Church,"

[1] Foucher, I. 17 ff. [2] *Ibid.*

to think out remedies for this great evil. God Himself has led the way by an important scheme "which has been broached for some time and which follows to all appearance the most practical method, and which might have considerable results if it was given a good trial." The initial ideas of this undertaking came from the Imperial Court. Some Protestants had been observed to show signs of toleration, so that the Emperor felt it to be a religious duty to encourage this spirit in the interests of Reunion. Disappointment met his earliest efforts; "there was, however, a prince (Ernest Augustus) who, at last, broke the ice and became the first to give his assistance at a formal discussion"; he believed that the way to Reunion had to be prepared by private conferences "before public and general negotiations could be undertaken with success, especially between parties which were so estranged from each other." "This prince . . . called a Conference of the chief theologians of his country." [1] A written declaration was delivered to the prince, a declaration which met the approval of the theologians of four other princes, "among whom there was one of the religion of those who are called 'reformed.'" Other princes would not go so far, but showed their goodwill by offering to do all they could to advance the undertaking. The Catholic professors and doctors of the four Catholic universities of Germany and the Netherlands and many theologians of the four principal religious Orders gave their approval to a scheme of Reunion founded on the written declaration. "Cardinals and nuncios, generals of religious Orders and even an Ecclesiastical Elector of the Empire, whose zeal and wisdom are well known, gave their approval to this work, recommending it and earnestly hoping that it would be continued." [2]

Meanwhile there was some disagreement among the Protestant theologians at Hanover. When Spinola returned it became necessary to revise the former negotiations in the light of these differences. "And it may be said, in the opinion of some of the most intelligent Catholics, who are beyond suspicion, that the Protestants have not explained their position in a manner more conformable to Catholic Church principles since the time of the Confession of Augsburg up to the present." [3] "And as on other occasions it

[1] Fouche, I. 20. [2] *Ibid.*, 21. [3] *Ibid.*, 22.

seemed impossible to reach a reconciliation in which the principles and the honour of both parties were respected—now, if these declarations are sincerely followed, it may be said that the possibility of reconciliation, which consists in finding the essential conditions, is reached." [1]

In order to obtain a better knowledge of the method of reconciliation it is necessary that God, according to the principles of the Catholic Apostolic Roman Church, in giving His Word or revelation to the Church, has also given the Holy Spirit, as the guide to its interpretation. Protestants seemed to hold opposite views, namely that Scripture alone was the Divine Law. However, it became clear that the "authorised and symbolic books" of the Protestants had been misunderstood; "since the Confession of Augsburg itself, which is the chief of these books, suggests quite the contrary in its reference to the decision of a free Council, and in its declaration that a departure must not be made from the opinion of the Church universal in the things which concern the truths of salvation." [2] Modern theologians have followed the true lead of the Confession of Augsburg, and have reached a position which makes it possible to lay sure foundations for the re-establishment of unity; "but the most important and principal part of the matter is that, should the recent declarations be sincere and have the results due to them, we may say that those who agree with them place themselves in the condition of being released from the reproach of formal heresy [3] as well as from schism, and might also be reconciled with the visible Catholic Apostolic Roman Church, should the Church judge the time opportune for granting dispensations, concessions or indulgences to this end." [4]

After a short divergence on a question of obedience to General Councils, which are held in doubt by a section of the Church (a question which he treated at great length later with Bossuet), he returns to the chief subject of the treatise. "To return," he continues, "to the present matter, this is what the declarations of the Protestants amount to." [5] His summary of the "Regulæ" may be given in the original. "Ils (les protestans) seront disposés à rentrer dans l'union

[1] Foucher, I. 22. [2] *Ibid.*, 23, 24.
[3] For the distinction between "formal" and "material" heresy see pp. 69, 140.
[4] Foucher, I. 24. [5] *Ibid.*, 26.

avec le siège apostolique et à reconnoistre tant le Pape pour le chef de l'église que les évesques et autres membres qui en composent l'hiérarchie ou le gouvernement, mais à condition qu'ils trouvent nécessaire et propre à gagner les esprits, qu'on leur laissera comme aux grecs et autres leur rite establi, autant qu'il est convenable pour ne pas choquer les peuples, et qu'on s'explique efficacement sur certaines controverses d'une manière qui ne soit point contraire a l'honneur deu à Dieu seul et au mérite de J. C., afin de lever les scruples des plus difficiles ou rigides." A reasonable explanation will settle many points of difference; others are mere "questions of the schools" which need not be decided one way or the other; "mais celles qui seront assez importantes et qui resteront sans conciliation seront remises (autant que de besoin) à la décision future de l'Église." "Parmy les controverses qui sont déjà conciliées en substance se peuvent compter: celle de la justification de l'homme par la grâce ou par les œuvres (qui passe pour la plus importante chez les protestans), celle du sacrifice de la Messe, des prières pour les défunts, du nombre des sacremens, de l'authorité de l'église, de la primauté du Pape, de la tradition, et plusieurs autres qui sont des plus considérables."

This is a succinct and accurate description of the "Regulæ" by a contemporary.

The treatise explains that Protestants showed hesitation in receiving the terms, but the best Protestant theologians are in agreement with them, provided "that use is made of the authority of the princes and chief Ministers of State and of the skill and influence of the chief theologians of the country, in preparing, apprising and enlisting people in private before entering on a course of practical policy." [1]

The great characteristic of the whole scheme is "that the principles and the honour of both parties remain in their entirety." [2] The material results will be splendid, "so that there is great cause for hope provided that zeal is not lacking and that every power and effort is used in a matter which is that of God, of the Church and of the Fatherland." [3]

The treatise *Des Méthodes de Réunion* is complementary to the *Relation pour la Cour Impériale*. It discusses the value of the various methods adopted for the restoration of Church

[1] Foucher, I. 30. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*, 31.

unity, and it deals with the work of Spinola, not merely as history but in the light of this abstract discussion. At the same time it opens with a confession of faith in the results of Spinola's efforts. "Of all the methods that have been proposed for the removal of this great schism of the West, which still prevails . . . I consider that of the Bishop of Tina, now of Neustadt, in agreement with certain Protestant theologians, to be the fairest." [1] It will, however, require great zeal and wisdom on the part of the Pope and of the Emperor and the chief princes to carry it into practice.

"The way of rigour" is criticised as "not always lawful nor safe, nor successful in reaching its aim." The "way of disputation or discussion" is unavailing; there is no basis of agreement possible; the disputants reply to their opponents when they think fit; they use invectives and jeerings to elude each other, so that it becomes more a matter of winning the plaudits of a party than of seeking peace. "That is the reason why the discussions and conferences have a habit of being fruitless and serve more often the sole purpose of embittering feeling and of bringing new controversies to birth." [2]

"The way of accommodation" seems barred. "For although it may be very true that there are controversies which consist only of misunderstanding—as, for example, the question of sacrifice, and the question of the superiority of the Pope in relation to General Councils, or the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin—yet there are other controversies" [3] which go deep down to essentials. That is why those who trusted to the way of accommodation by saying "that it was necessary to be satisfied with the Articles taught by the first Œcumenical Councils, and to recognise as brethren in Jesus Christ those who are in agreement with this," [4] have been looked on as a new sect. In reality discussions are multiplied instead of being ended by this means, and the principles of every party are offended.

However, there remains one way still open, and it embraces all the good qualities of the others as well as allowing the principles of both Catholics and Protestants to stand. Leibnitz becomes enthralled by the thought of it. "It seems to me," he says, "that it is the work of Divine Pro-

[1] Foucher, II. 1. [2] *Ibid.*, 3. [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*

vidence, who Himself has desired that, notwithstanding this great enmity between the parties, there should be left a way of reaching Reunion without resort to arms and disputes, and subject to the principles of both Catholics and Protestants." [1]

The principle of this new "way" is clear. "The fundamental basis of Catholicism is that a Christian is within the inner Communion of the Church, and is neither a heretic nor a schismatic, when he has the spirit of obedience and is ready to believe, and desirous of learning what God reveals, not only by the Word of Holy Scripture, but also by His unwritten Word, which performs the office of interpretation, and of which He has made His Church the guardian." [2] If a man is in this "spirit of submission," he cannot be a "formal heretic" if he ignorantly believes some article of heresy. Also "they who doubt whether a particular Council is œcumenical and believe that their opinion is based on good reasons . . . are not heretics, provided that they faithfully and sincerely recognise the power of the Councils of the Catholic Church." [3] Examples are plentiful. The Councils of Constance and Basel were accepted in France and in part of Germany, but there were doubts about them in Italy. The last Lateran Council under Leo X is accepted as œcumenical in Italy, but some Catholics hold doubts about it. The Council of Trent was coldly received in France, "and though the clergy desired in States Assembly, held after the death of Henry IV, that it should be recognised as œcumenical by an authentic act, the Third Estate and the royal Courts were opposed to it."

The Protestant principle can be reconciled with this. In spite of much misunderstanding about the Confession of Augsburg, the Protestant Electors, Princes and Free Cities, etc., "have declared, since the publication of a book (by a Saxon theologian) which was presented and read in the Diet of Augsburg (1530), in the presence of the Emperor Charles V, that they did not deny the judgment of the Church as declared by a General Council"; [4] they even offer to appear at such a Council; and although Protestants have shown opposition to the Council of Trent, chiefly because they had no voice in it, "that does not prevent their being obliged still to submit to a General Council which is

[1] Foucher, II. 4. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*, 7.

held in due order, unless they openly renounce the Confession of Augsburg." [1]

This fact has not been emphasised sufficiently until the present negotiations of Spinola, Bishop of Tina. "For the said Prelate, having received letters of trust and recommendation from his Imperial Majesty, has entered the Courts of several of the Protestant Princes and Electors of the Empire, for the purpose of requesting from them a positive declaration and to learn from them whether they are yet of the same opinion as their ancestors and ready to yield to the judgment of the Universal Church, should it please the Pope to call a General Council." [2] Moreover it was part of his business to sound the minds of the Protestants as to whether it was possible "to find the means for a preliminary but real union—while they wait for the decision of the said future Council." [3] The terms were to be liberal.

The rest of the treatise is very similar to its companion treatise described above; it covers the history of the negotiations at the Court of Hanover, and apart from verifying the facts already mentioned, it adds little to our knowledge. The concluding words, however, are of value because they describe the opinion of Leibnitz on the practical possibilities of the negotiations. He feels that the marriage of bishops and the acknowledgment of Protestant Orders present the greatest difficulties. "Lastly," he says, "we must agree that there are still considerable difficulties in the Declaration of the Protestant theologians—particularly in reference to the marriage of bishops, which is customary to-day, so far as I know, only among Protestants, and in regard to the validity of Protestant Ordinations, the Pope not being able to give his approval to the past, according to the principles of the Roman Church." [4] Leibnitz thinks that there should be little difficulty over the former question because the difference between a bishop and a priest does not touch the marriage state, and he even hints that the Protestants may themselves yield on this point. On the latter question, he feels that Protestants would perhaps wait for the decision of a future Council if they are not asked, meanwhile, to affirm the invalidity of their orders. Then "while they wait and in the future, after the Reunion, they should be looked upon as rightly ordained, by giving them

[1] Foucher, II. 8. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* [4] *Ibid.*, 29.

Orders in some special way, which, in Catholic opinion, would have all that is necessary to a true ordination, and, in Protestant opinion, might be regarded as a confirmation of what they already claim, until the intervention of the judgment of the Catholic Church, assembled in Council." [1] As for the difficulties of execution, Leibnitz is quite cognisant of them, but prefers to say nothing on this depressing side of the work. "It is for those who do not approve of these efforts," he concludes, "to make a list; and for all those who are well disposed towards them to make their contribution . . . towards overcoming the difficulties, just as if they themselves were the originators and supporters of these plans. For we can truly say that since the Conference of Ratisbon of the past century, nothing has proceeded authoritatively from the Protestants, in the way of making the restoration of unity possible, like the declaration which I have just described." [2]

These treatises speak for themselves. They are the strongest evidence for the keen interest which Leibnitz took in every movement towards the Reunion of the Churches. Above all they are patent proof against the view of Guhrauer and his imitators on the relation of Leibnitz to the work of Spinola and the Protestant theologians. That relation was of the most intimate nature.

Guhrauer worked out his Biography from comparatively few sources, and on the religious aspect of his subject he was limited to the letters of Bossuet (in Dutens) and some few other letters. His judgment on the negotiations of Spinola is therefore imperfect. The first visit of the Bishop of Tina to the Court of Hanover, according to Guhrauer, made no impression on Leibnitz; or rather, while the newly appointed librarian was full of joy at the general movement towards Reunion, he was careful not to mention the name of Spinola in all his correspondence.[3] Nor did his attitude change, in the opinion of Guhrauer, during the second visit. Leibnitz had no part in the Conference of March 1683.[4] In fact, Leibnitz is said to have written to Seckendorf on the 1st of April, 1684, to the effect that he had spoken with Spinola on several occasions, but neither the

[1] Foucher, II. 29.
[2] *Ibid.*, 21.
[3] Guhrauer, I. 363.
[4] *Ibid.*, II. 27.

circumstances of the time nor the personal character and qualifications of the Bishop were such as to give him much confidence. Unfortunately, Guhrauer gives no reference for this letter.

Rommel, writing one year later than Guhrauer, copies his immediate predecessor. "Spinola," he says, "did not quite reach the expectations of Leibnitz (as he wrote in confidence to Seckendorf, the celebrated historian of the German Reformation); he was not a profound theologian, and did not represent the mind of the whole Church, as Bossuet did." [1] Rommel follows Guhrauer again in the inaccurate date for the first visit of Spinola. It is an amazing fact that the editor of the correspondence of Leibnitz and the Landgrave Ernest should follow an argument in his preface which the whole trend of the correspondence belies. Leibnitz had the deepest admiration for Spinola, and was personally interested in every move towards Reunion.[2]

Foucher has exploded this false view by the publication of two volumes of Leibnitz's unpublished theological and religious works. The two treatises, described above, are sufficient to show that Leibnitz was completely in sympathy with the spirit and mind of Spinola. But there is abundant evidence of a more personal kind in support of this thesis. Leibnitz writes to Bossuet in the following terms. "Everybody has a very high opinion of your book of controversies, and the Bishop of Tina, who came here on behalf of the Emperor, and who has spent much thought on these subjects, believing with you that we must use gentle measures, received a copy from His Royal Highness, my master, and was charmed with it." [3] Bossuet regards the relation of Leibnitz and Spinola as so intimate that he ventures, on May 1, 1679, to send a copy of a new edition of the *Exposition*, through Leibnitz, to Spinola. In a further letter, Leibnitz shows his admiration for the work of Spinola by telling Bossuet that "the Bishop of Tina . . . works hard at everything which may contribute to the reunion of souls." [4]

The letter of welcome from Leibnitz to Spinola has been mentioned. There is a similar letter from Spinola to Leib-

[1] Rommel, I. 226.
[2] Russell also follows Guhrauer, p. xc.
[3] Foucher, I. 62.
[4] *Ibid.*, 65.

nitz dated 4 July, 1683.[1] Its terms confirm the other evidence. It opens, "Most Noble, active and most experienced Lord, and most gracious friend." As late as 12 Dec., 1688, when the relations of Spinola and Leibnitz might have been congealed by the growing opposition to the cause of Reunion, Spinola opens a letter in the following terms: "My distinguished, busy and most highly esteemed Sir, I hope that the catarrh has gone." [2] He then proceeds to discuss the question of Reunion. without any hint that he differed from his correspondent. Leibnitz answered in the same tone on 9 January, 1689.

When it is also remembered that Leibnitz, not content with corresponding with the successor of Spinola at Neustadt, paid a personal visit there, where "he made in his own hand a copy of the most important documents relative to the negotiations begun by Spinola," [3] it becomes clear that Guhrauer and his followers have taken a false view of the relation of Leibnitz to the work of Spinola.

Leibnitz was therefore a keen supporter of the "Regulæ." Although he was not officially engaged in the theological conferences of Hanover, he was in the closest personal touch with the chief members of the Conference like Spinola and Molanus. If the correspondence of Bossuet and of the Landgrave Ernest may be taken as a test, we may be certain that he was consulted throughout the Conference. His tolerant large mind, trained under the tutelage of the great Boineburg, would respond to the generous terms of the theologians at the Court of Hanover. Although there is no direct evidence for it, we shall not be far from the truth in tracing a great deal of the tolerance and wide sympathy of the "Regulæ" to the mind of the man, who in those days was consulted on all sides by the greatest men of his day. Leibnitz rejoiced over the work of Spinola and the Hanoverian theologians, because a large part of his own opinions on Reunion were embodied there through the instrumentality of his most cherished friends.

[1] Foucher, I. 92. [2] *Ibid.*, 121. [3] *Ibid.*, xviii.

CHAPTER IV

THE *SYSTEMA THEOLOGICUM*

"The frequent assertion that Leibnitz did not intend the 'Systema' to be taken seriously and that it did not contain his own personal convictions must be entirely rejected."—PICHLER, I. 191.

LEIBNITZ was actively interested in the Reunion Movement at the Court of Hanover; but it was not until more than a century after his death that the world knew anything definite about his detailed and personal views on the subject. For many years there had been rumours of the existence of a curious MS. in the Royal Library at Hanover. M. Murr, editor of the *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte*, had seen and examined it. "It is preserved," he says, "in the Royal Library of Hanover, but is without title or preface. M. Jung, Aulic Councillor and Librarian, has transcribed, in 150 folio pages, this singular work, which will cause a greater sensation than all the rest of the works of Leibnitz. In it he defends the Catholic religion, and even upon the points which are most warmly debated between Catholics and Protestants, with so much zeal, that it would hardly be possible to believe him to be the author, were not his writing perfectly known by a thousand records." [1] M. Jung, the Keeper of the Library, writes with first-hand experience: "The *System of Theology* which Leibnitz has left behind him, written with his own hand, approaches very closely to the doctrine of Grotius, and on most points is perfectly identical with it; and in many doubtful and controverted questions, I doubt whether an adherent of the Roman Church could find a more powerful and yet more moderate advocate of his cause." [2]

[1] *Journal zur Geschichte-Nürnberg*, March 11, 1779, p. 129 (quoted Russell, pp. xx, xxi).
[2] Russell, p. xxi.

When Jerome Bonaparte was crowned King of Hanover in 1808, the Abbé Emery, Superior of the Congregation of S. Sulpice, determined to use political power in the interests of learning. He had been a deep student of the irenical works of Leibnitz, and was keenly interested in the curious MS. which was lodged within the archives of Hanover. Through the influence of the new King's uncle, Cardinal Fesch, he obtained a decree (dated Sept. 17, 1810) for the removal of the MS. to Paris. M. Feder, the Librarian at Hanover at that time, received the order and transmitted the MS. in October of the same year; later, he was commanded to transmit the transcript of the MS. made by his predecessor, M. Jung. Old age, overwork and political controversies, however, prevented the Abbé Emery from carrying out his cherished wish of publishing the MS. The task was passed on to others.

Before his death, nevertheless, he had ordered a copy to be made for the Press. A careless hand was employed, with the result that "numberless words were mistaken; many were omitted as illegible in the manuscript, which can be deciphered without the slightest difficulty; several Greek words, especially, were strangely confounded (so far, indeed, as to lead to the suspicion that the copyist was not a Greek scholar even in the lowest sense of the word), though written in a clear and legible hand; an entire paragraph, which contains the author's opinion on the nature of the intention requisite in the administration of sacraments, is left out altogether; and more than one clause and sentence are unaccountably omitted, either through mere inadvertence on the part of the copyist, or from some other cause which it is difficult to explain." [1]

When the papers of the Abbé were transferred to his successor in the office of Superior of the Congregation of St. Sulpice, M. Garnier, the work of publication was continued. But the autograph was no longer at hand. After the Restoration (1815) it had been carried to Rome by Cardinal Fesch. The Paris edition of 1819 was therefore made from the defective copy.

At Rome, the work of copying the MS. was entrusted to the Abbate Pietro Pistelli, the secretary of Cardinal Fesch. He had completed his task before the publication

[1] Russell, p. xxiii.

of the Paris edition, but as he was unable to publish before the appearance of the defective work his copy did not reach the Press. The MS. together with this copy remained with Pistelli until his death in 1839 (March). By his will they were to pass into the keeping of Cardinal Fesch, but his Eminence died in April of the same year. Complications set in. The Cardinal had bequeathed all his books and MSS. to the city of Bastia, in his native Corsica. The Hanoverian Ambassador in Rome raised objections. After some controversy the MS. was deposited in the Presbytery of San Luigi dei Francesi, under the care of the French Charities in the Papal States. In June 1843 it was restored to Count de Survilliers, the nephew and heir of the late Cardinal. Finally it was presented by the Count to M. Kestner, the Hanoverian Ambassador at Rome, and in October 1843, after wandering round Europe for thirty-three years, it returned to its original resting-place.

It is important to follow the text of the real autograph and not that of the Paris copy of 1819. For this purpose the edition of Foucher, copied from the original at Hanover, and the English translation of Russell, are excellent. Dr. Russell, a professor of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, visited Rome and saw the MS. itself. He had actually published a copy of the Paris edition in 1841, but, finding it so incorrect, he published an English version of the original MS. by the aid of the Abbé Lacroix' splendid and accurate copy.[1]

An outline of this curious and almost unknown work will help us to penetrate the mind of Leibnitz in his relation to the efforts for Reunion; but a word must be said by way of preface on the title. The autograph, as it left the pen of Leibnitz, is without a title of any sort. Another hand, perhaps that of one of the later librarians of the Royal Library, has entitled it "G. G. Leibnitii Systema Theologicum, ipsius auctoris manu scriptum, Constans XV, Plagulis seu Philuris." This title has taken the premier place. Other titles are as follows: "Exposition de la Doctrine de Leibniz sur la Religion," in the French edition

[1] The best editions are *Leibnitzens System der Theologie, Nach dem Manuscripte von Hannover (den Lateinischen Text zur Seite) ins Deutsche Uebersetzt*, von Dr. Räss und Dr. Weiss; *Gulielmi Gottifredi Leibnitii Opusculum, Adscititio Titulo "Systema Theologicum" Inscriptum*, Abbé Lacroix, Paris, 1845.

of 1819; "G. G. Leibnitii Examen Religionis Christianæ," adopted by the Abbate Pistelli; and that suggested by Guhrauer in the Appendix of his edition of the German Works, "Expositio Doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, ad restituendam Ecclesiæ Pacem" (Vol. II. p. 70).

The opening sentence is an expression of the sincerity and fairness which characterised the whole religious outlook of Leibnitz. "After a long and mature examination of the controversies on the subject of religion," he says, "in which I have invoked the Divine assistance and divested myself as far perhaps as is possible for man of party feeling, as though I came from a new world, a neophyte unattached to any party, I have at length fixed in my own mind, and, after full consideration, resolved to adopt, the following principles, which, to an unprejudiced man, will appear to carry with them the recommendation of sacred Scripture, of pious antiquity and even of right reason and the authority of history."

God.[1] The conception of God is governed by two predominant ideas, that of order and that of beneficence. "Anyone who could understand the whole order of the divine economy would find therein a model of the most perfect form of Commonwealth, in which it would be impossible for a philosopher to find a single want, or to supply anything in desire." That is a succinct statement of Leibnitz's idea of Divine order; of the beneficence of God, which results in a philosophy of unmitigated optimism, he writes: "All things must conduce to the good of those who love God."

Sin. The beneficence of God influences the conception of sin. God is not the cause of sin; "in all creatures however exalted there is, antecedent to all sin, a certain inborn and original finiteness which renders them liable to fall." "The cause of evil arises not from God, but from nothing . . . or, in other words, from that finiteness of creatures of which we have already spoken." God could have created impeccable beings, but He preferred to turn sin into a greater good. "The fall of Adam was corrected with an immeasurable gain of perfection by the

[1] In addition to the traditional view of God as "One, Eternal, Omnipresent, and Almighty."

Incarnation of the Word, and the treason of Judas by the Redemption of the human race."

Revelation. God enters into society with other intelligences in His great Commonwealth, "the City of God," and therefore acts in relation to other beings as well as governing, "according to certain fixed rules, the entire machine of the universe." Revelation becomes the mark of God's entry into society. It must have certain marks, "commonly called motives of credibility," by which all illusion and false interpretations are avoided. Right reason is the natural interpreter of God. But reason, when she has performed her duty, must submit to faith. "And this may be understood from the example of a governor who commands in a province or garrison as the representative of his prince; he will not lightly, nor without cautious scrutiny of his credentials, yield up his authority to the successor who may be sent to replace him, lest an enemy steal in under this guise. But the moment he recognises his master's will, he will at once, without dispute, submit himself and the entire garrison to the new authority." This leads naturally to the "internal operation of the Holy Ghost," by which faith may exist apart from "the analysis of faith," which some people have not the power to make. Prophecy is the chief mark of revelation; "for to predict future events accurately and circumstantially exceeds not only all human but even all created powers." Miracle too implies the aid of "a superhuman power."

The Trinity. "A person generally is a substance numerically one and incommunicable," but in God "there are three singular substances and one absolute relation which embraces these and whose undivided nature is communicated to each." Signs of this are to be found within our own minds. "It was by this illustration, adapted to our comprehension, that the ancients were wont, and in my opinion judiciously, to explain this mystery, viz. by the analogy of the three chief faculties of the mind or requisites of action, namely, power, knowledge and will." "From the Virtue or Power (Father) of the Divine Essence spring ideas of things, or truths; these Wisdom (the Son) embraces; and thus, in the end, they become, according to their several perfection, objects of the Will (the Holy Ghost)." The doctrines of the Catholic Church

on the Trinity are safe; those of her adversaries replete with danger; as also are the doctrines on the

INCARNATION. "The Word . . . assumed our entire human nature, consisting of soul and body . . . and acted as man in everything except sin." The whole aim of the Incarnation was the "expiation of the human race, which was the first care of God."

"With regard to the mode of the union of natures, many subtle questions are raised, which it would have been better to have left untouched. . . . It is enough to know that the properties which are attributed to each nature separately may rightly be attributed to the concrete; for it is correct to say that in Christ God suffered, man is omniscient and omnipotent; but to attribute to humanity, in virtue of the union, omnipotence, ubiquity and, what specially follows, eternity, is as incongruous as to ascribe to the Divinity the having been born and suffered; a form of speech which is either an impropriety or a contradiction."

JUSTIFICATION. Christ became a "most worthy victim for the expiation of the guilt of the human race," but every man must enter into possession of that redemption by an act of repentance and by "a resolution of amendment." "In the course of the last century, certain angry controversies arose on the questions of the conversion of man, of the justification of the sinner, and of the merit of good works, occasioned by the inconvenient expressions of some of the disputants and the excesses of others on the opposite side. In my opinion, however, they may easily be adjusted if one will but discard the sophistry in which they have been involved and consider the subject on its own merits."

The question of Election, Free Will, Grace, Justification by Faith, Assurance, Original Sin, Good Works, Merit, are all discussed in the same independent spirit. Where the controversy is merely one of definitions, the true kernel is brought clearly to view; where it is a question of extreme views, the *via media* is shown to be in harmony with the ancient Church, Scripture and reason, *e.g.* on the question of Original Sin, "We must be careful not to underrate the evil influence of Original Sin . . . but neither should we,

on the other hand, so far exaggerate its evil effects, as to say that no good whatever is left and that every act of the unregenerate is of itself a sin."

While the first part of the *Systema* is interesting as an introduction to the mind in which Leibnitz approached religious questions, it is less important for our purpose than the second part, which opens with a picture of Christ, not as Mediator but as Legislator. "We must recollect that Christ is not only our Mediator . . . but also our Legislator, who in virtue of the 'all-power given to Him in heaven and on earth' has prescribed certain laws which cannot be despised without peril of salvation, while their observance will avail very much thereto." "The institutions of Christ in His character of Legislator consist in the mode of Divine worship which is peculiar to Christians, and the Sacraments of the New Law." The Sacraments are to receive treatment later. "The distinctive character of Divine worship among Christians consists in our adoring in Christ-Man the almighty and eternal God, in our invoking Christ as the Mediator of salvation, and offering to God Himself a perpetual Sacrifice of Propitiation, viz. the Body and Blood of Our Lord under the appearance of Bread and Wine." There are also "ceremonial observances which the Church has added for the sake of order and decency," like the veneration of images and the relics of saints, observances which have their value when "freed from superstition and abuse." Great care must be exercised over the Adoration of Christ. "I cannot assent to the opinion of those who think that the right of Divine Honour has been communicated to Christ's humanity in itself; an opinion defended not only by Socinians . . . but by others also." Divine honours are only due to Him because of His Divinity. It is wrong to stop short of the Act of Adoring the Divine Love and to rest our thoughts in the love and veneration of Christ's humanity alone. Such weaknesses make it possible for the fable to spread that the God of the Christians was given in pledge in the Host to one of the Sultans of Egypt; and to the bitter sarcasm of the Arabian philosopher, who said that he had heard of nothing more silly than the Christian religion, which commanded that its God should be eaten. "This is a fault into which we see

preachers and writers commonly fall, rather labouring in their words and writings to inflame the devotion of the people, by pandering to the imagination and to a certain sensual affection of the carnal mind than seeking to inculcate the adoration of the invisible Deity, which consists in 'spirit and in truth,' and is the last and highest object of our worship." The most Holy Soul and Body of Christ are adored, not in themselves, but in virtue of their union with the Divinity.

CEREMONIES. On the other hand, we need the appeal to the senses. "For everyone who seriously considers the nature of our mind as it exists in this body will easily admit that, although we can form within the mind ideas of things which are outside the sphere of the sense, yet we are unable notwithstanding to fix our thoughts upon them and to dwell on them with attention, unless there be superadded to the internal idea certain sensible signs such as words, characters, representations, likenesses, examples, associations or effects." They should be pleasing, and divested of all superfluities, which distract rather than assist the mind, *e.g.* in his MS. an author may use similes, examples, apothegms, and even musical construction and harmonious cadence, but he must avoid bombastic expressions, pedantic words, elaborate rhythms, every species of affectation, and, in a word, everything that does not soothe the mind but turns it away from the consideration of the supreme object to secondary things. Rhetoric takes a place lower than oratory for this reason. "It is the same in sacred things; whatever leads the mind most effectually to the consideration of God's goodness and greatness . . . produces pious thoughts, nay, whatever renders devotion sweet and pleasing, all this is deserving of approval." "Hence I am of opinion that God does not disregard as unworthy of His service the use of musical instruments, nor vocal harmony, nor beautiful hymns, nor sacred eloquence, nor lights, nor incense, nor precious vestments, jewelled vases or other offerings; nor statues, nor graven images of pious objects, nor the laws of architecture and perspective, nor public processions, the chiming of bells, the strewing the streets with carpets, and the other expedients which the overflowing piety of the people has devised for the Divine honour and which certain people in their morose

simplicity despise." The spirit and the senses must work in harmony.

IMAGE WORSHIP is an example of Christian worship. "The Jews and the Saracens held the veneration which is paid to images among the reasons of their hatred against Christians." But "what object have we in reading, or listening to, histories but in order that the images which they represent may be painted on our memory?" "We should gratefully acknowledge as a great gift of God the arts of painting and sculpture, through whose aid we obtain enduring images representing the objects with the utmost accuracy, vividness and beauty; by the sight of which (in the impossibility of referring to the originals) the internal images may be renewed and, like the impression of a seal on wax, more deeply imprinted on the mind." Abuses are to be closely watched. Abraham dispensed with them altogether; because "in the designs of God and of the holy men of that age it seemed more safe to lean to the opposite side and to dispense altogether with a matter which in itself is good and useful but still is unessential." If this fear existed to-day it would be necessary to put images away altogether, as in the case of the Brazen Serpent, which was leading Israel into idolatry. "In the same way also it would be advisable to abstain from introducing them among a people who would, perhaps, be deterred from embracing Christianity, by their detestation of images —a contingency which may yet arise among the Arabs, the Persians, the Scythians, and the other nations of the East." The Church had differences on the question. "Some scholastics" said that the adoration paid to an image was the same as the "Latria" to Christ Himself. "In these times, however, it would seem to be useful and conducive to piety to abstain, for the purpose of avoiding scandal, from all those expressions of the scholastics which convey that an image is to be reverenced with the divine honour of Latria." The Council of Trent was right in prudently avoiding them. We can only allow "the veneration of the original in the presence of the image." In this sense "I do not see what evil there can be in bowing down before an image of the crucifix and, while we look upon it, honouring Him whom it represents; whereas, on the other hand, its advantages are manifest, inasmuch as it is certain that

it has a wondrous effect in exciting the affection. We have already seen that such was the practice of Saint Gregory the Great; nor are the followers of the Augsburg Confession entirely averse to it." There is one plausible objection; namely, that it is safer to abstain from a practice which is at all doubtful. A trivial doubt comes from a scrupulous conscience. "I admit, indeed, that in the present dispositions of many Protestants (to say nothing of Jews and Mohamedans) much offence arises from the use of images; but, on the other hand, it must be considered what tumults and scandals, what rivers of blood, would be necessary in order to eliminate this usage from the Church, which in itself and apart from abuses and scandals on both sides is a most excellent and praiseworthy one." Some Protestants find image worship no cause for disunion; and some "learned Catholics" think that the Protestants who refuse it might be permitted to enter the Church.

SAINTS AND ANGELS. Saints and Angels are interested in the things of this world. They may be invoked as channels to God. "Help me, O Peter," means "Pray for me to God." The increased vision of the Blessed enables them to see "at a single view the affairs of Asia and of Europe, and while embracing so vast a range to penetrate nevertheless into its minutest parts." A general can view his whole army from an eminence; so that "if the vision is extended more than a thousandfold by the use of telescopes and microscopes, shall we doubt that God can grant to the Blessed much more than Galileo or Drebel has given to us?" Details can be seen clearly in the whole. "To how many objects does a chess-player apply his mind by one glance?" There is plenty of evidence for the invocation of the Saints in the Early Church. And if we deny the evidence of the Fathers we must deny the doctrine of the Trinity, as it is not to be gleaned from the Bible itself. Of course there have been abuses; "in our own times grave complaints have emanated from bishops, not only in France and Belgium but also in Spain and Italy, and from other eminent men." But we must be careful not to uproot the wheat with the tares. "Protestants should reflect that the truth is sacrificed by excessive altercation; that by mutual hatred men are carried into excesses; and that the Church is not to be accused solely because she

is unable to remove, by a single stroke, everything that she seriously and severely condemns." In conclusion, the Invocation of Saints may be regarded "in the light of a supplementary devotion and of a simple mark of our reverence and humility towards God and love for God's friends, and that the substance of the worship may always be addressed directly to God Himself." "If the veneration and Invocation of Saints be circumscribed within these limits it is, though not of necessity, not only tolerable but praiseworthy."

The third part of the *Systema* deals with the Sacraments. "Having completed . . . all that appertains to general worship . . . we must now come to the Sacraments, which constitute a peculiar kind of worship, and consist of certain sacred rites instituted by Christ to which a promise of grace is superadded." There are seven Sacraments, though the "washing of feet" has been added by some. "The minister of a Sacrament is sometimes a bishop as in the Sacraments of Orders and Confirmation; sometimes a priest as in the Sacraments of the Eucharist, Penance and Extreme Unction; sometimes any one of the faithful, as in the Sacraments of Baptism and Matrimony." The "intention of doing what the Church does" is a necessary condition of validity. The indelible sign impressed on the soul in the Sacrament need not be further described than as "a certain permanent quality, the reiteration of which is invalid and unlawful." "By baptism men are made Christians, by confirmation they are attached to the Christian soldiery by a new and, as it were, a closer sacramental bond; by receiving Orders they become ministers of the Church. And these unquestionably are permanent qualities."

The efficacy of the Sacrament "*ex opere operato*" is easily explained. "For indeed, if the Sacraments availed only by the disposition of the recipient and not by the efficacy of the rite there would really be no special grace attached to these rites; they would be mere ceremonies, the observance of which perhaps is prescribed and cannot be omitted without crime, but which possess no intrinsic efficacy; because (were it not for the prohibition) whatever good these rites contain would, with equal certainty, be obtained

without the performance of them by virtue of the general promises which have been made to those who possess faith and charity." At the same time "a certain '*opus operantis*' . . . is indispensable for the '*opus operatum*.'"

BAPTISM. "The controversies agitated concerning it at the present day are neither very important nor numerous." It should be remembered, however, that Infant Baptism is based on the authority of the Church and not on Holy Scripture; and "that those who reject the authority of the Church cannot withstand the force of the arguments of the Anabaptists."

CONFIRMATION is based on the New Testament and on apostolic tradition. It is a distinct and separate sacrament because the Church saw fit to make it the work of a legitimate minister; and whereas baptism was administered to infants, Confirmation waited for the years of discretion.

THE EUCHARIST. "I come to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, upon which the greater weight of the controversy has turned." Some maintain that "the Body and Blood of Christ are not really present in the Lord's Supper, but are only represented or signified." His Body is said to be as far removed from us as heaven is from earth, and a thing which possesses the true nature of a body cannot be in more than one place simultaneously. Others admit "that we really receive the Body of Christ, but receive it through the medium of the mind which is raised up to heaven by faith; and that, consequently, as faith alone is the instrument of receiving, the Sacrament is not received by the unworthy—a doctrine which seems entirely opposed to the words of the Apostle." But this implies a power of the mind which they deny to Christ's Body; otherwise it simply means that the mind flies to heaven in the same way as we are said to be in thought at Rome or Constantinople. It is better to follow the words of Christ, "THIS IS MY BODY." Pious antiquity always regarded the presence of Christ in the Sacrament as a great mystery, but there could be no mystery if it be merely a sign. "And indeed every existing Church in the entire world, with the exception of the Reformed Churches and those which have sunk lower than the Reformed in innovation, admit the real Presence of Christ's Body." The discussions of learned men compel us to admit that this is proven or that "we

must abandon all hope that anything shall ever be proved regarding the opinions of distant nations." The essence of a body does not consist in filling a determinate space; otherwise it would be necessary to resort to the allegorical interpretation. But the essence of a body is proved to consist "in the principle of action and of passion"; "for it is the essence of a substance to be capable of acting and suffering."

Some believe in the impanation theory, that the Body of Christ is given "in, with, and under the Bread" (in, cum et sub pane); just in the same way as if someone displayed a purse and said, "This is money." But the Church has interpreted the Scripture for us. There is a definite change in the Bread and Wine themselves. "The Latins have aptly rendered it 'Transubstantiation'; and it has been defined that the whole substance of the Bread and Wine is changed into the whole substance of the Body and Blood of Christ." The accidents remain what they were; the substance only is changed. The accidents do really remain; they are not transformed in any way into "an appearance—or empty dream-like apparition" as some think.

The moment of Transubstantiation takes place at Consecration, not at the moment of Communion. Otherwise the words of Christ mean nothing, and we are involved in great complexity "as to whether the conversion first commences on the lips, or in the mouth, or in the throat, or in the stomach; or indeed whether it takes place even there . . . if through any defect of the organs the symbols are not consumed." "However, as there are, especially among the members of the Reformed Church, some eminent and acute-minded men, who, deeply imbued with the principles of a certain new and captivating philosophy, imagine . . . that they understand clearly and distinctly that the essence of a body consists in extension, that accidents are but modes of a substance, and therefore that they can no more subsist without a subject . . . than uniformity of circumference can be separated from a circle; and as it is from this fancied evidence that their deplorable and almost insuperable aversion for the doctrines of the Catholic Church arises, I think that it is our duty to consult for their malady, and that Catholic philosophers should

labour . . . not only to satisfy the objections clearly and lucidly, but even to establish accurately the contrary doctrine."

A confession follows. "Though it must be confessed that in the beginning we inclined to the very opinions to which we have just alluded, yet we have been compelled, by the progress of study, to return to the principles of the old philosophy" Matter differs from extension. Over and above its dimensions, matter possesses what the ancients called resistance or "mass," by which bodies act on each other. The effects of "mass" cannot be derived from extension alone. "Mass or power of resisting and effort or power of acting" are "something absolute and real superadded" to corporeal substance. Substance and accidents are distinct and can be separated by God. "The essence of a thing consists in that property in virtue of which it remains the same, though under different dimensions and qualities, and in consequence of which the essence is not divisible or variable along with its dimensions or changeable along with its qualities." God can make the essence remain after divesting it entirely of its dimensions and qualities; "He may also cause the same thing to have different dimensions and qualities simultaneously; or the same real accident to appertain to different substances; and lastly He may sustain the dimensions and qualities, the thing or essence being entirely taken away."

This philosophy helps to explain "the mystery of the Eucharist."

Great commotions have arisen over the manner of communicating. Christ instituted Communion in both kinds; the Early Church had no doubts about it. But Communion in one kind followed naturally from a feeling of reverence and from "the greater liability of the liquid element to perish or to be destroyed." There were precedents in Scripture as in "the breaking of the bread" at Emmaus; and in the Early Church, where bishops sent the bread alone, even as far as from Rome to Asia, as a pledge of unity.[1]

Since, therefore, it was considered permissible to dispense

[1] Some interesting references are given to Intinction, and to "sucking instruments" (instrumentum suctorium)—"some of these tubes are preserved even to this day."

with the use of the chalice from early times when there were approved reasons, it is not a question of a true Communion but whether we may depart from the words of Holy Scripture. "And there are some Protestants who admit that, if a person have a natural abhorrence of wine, he may be content with the Communion of the Bread alone. Now, I ask, what more pressing cause can there be than the desire of avoiding schism and of preserving unity in the Church and public charity? I hold it to be certain therefore that the withdrawal of the chalice cannot supply one with a just cause of seceding from the Church."

Wafer has been put in place of bread, in order to prevent crumbling. It is not because "any indignity can occur to Christ and His most sacred Body," but "nowadays a much higher degree of outward reverence is shown even to these elements—for it is certain that in sacred rites and in divine worship some things which are not essential vary with time."

The settlement of the question for our own times "pertains not to private persons but to the rulers of the Church and especially to the Sovereign Pope, to whom the Council of Trent has left the regulation of the entire matter." History shows how the Bohemians and some Catholic Greeks were granted the restoration of the chalice. "And everyone knows the solicitations which were addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff and the Council of Trent by the ambassadors of the Emperor, the King of France, and the Duke of Bavaria, all strictly Catholic princes, as also the concession which the Pope at last made to the prayers of the Emperor—and I should think that if, at the present day, it would be possible, by a similar indulgence, to bring back some nation, or to obtain some great advantage for the Church, it would not be difficult to induce the Pontiff to accede." But the Church must lead and her subjects must obey, lest a schism arise.

ADORATION OF THE EUCHARIST is not primitive, because the devotion of the early Christians did not need it. "But by degrees, as they began to grow cool, it became necessary to employ external signs and institute solemn rites which might serve to remind men of their duty and to revive the ardour of devotion." The most suitable moment was at

the Eucharist. God is omnipresent, but conditions demand the "marking off of certain times, places, causes and occasions." "And indeed the wisdom of these usages is so manifest that even the Lutherans adore in the moment of receiving the Eucharist, although they go no further, not believing the Body of Christ to be present sacramentally, except in the actual eating thereof." There can be no objection to adoration, because it is "to Christ that the adoration is directed," and it does not concern "by any means this small, round, thin, white thing which has the qualities of bread, much less the whiteness or roundness themselves."

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE. Christ not only offered Himself once but continues His work of Sacrifice. He gives Himself back to us anew in this Sacrament as often as the Consecration is repeated, without in any sense adding any new efficacy to the Sacrifice of Calvary. Christ is the only Worthy Offering which could be presented to God. Scripture mentions this "perpetual Sacrifice" in Daniel and under the figure of Melchisedec. But it is the culmination of the less worthy sacrifices of the Old Testament. The Fathers agree in their interpretation on this point; Augustine calls it the "unbloody sacrifice."

PRIVATE MASSES originated in the failure of early piety and in the promiscuous nature of the Christian congregation. Unworthy Communions were to be avoided. "It would have been wrong nevertheless that, because communicants were not always found, the Divine Honour should therefore suffer any diminution. Hence, when the laudable and pious practice of daily celebrating the most Holy Sacrifice in every Church was established, it followed as a consequence, that the Communion of the Priest who offered was regarded as sufficient. This is the origin of what they call Private Masses."

The remaining Sacraments are briefly discussed. An interesting note on the vernacular occurs. "In these days there certainly can be no want," he says in reference to following the service in Church, "considering the number of books, in the vernacular languages, containing a full explanation of the Canon of the Mass and of all that appertains to Divine Worship, which have been published." A somewhat ingenious account of the origin of auricular

confession is given. "Although of old while the fervour of piety was greater than it is now, public confession and penance were in use among Christians, nevertheless, in consideration of our weakness, it has pleased God to make known to the Faithful, through the Church, the sufficiency of a Private Confession made to a Priest."

ORDERS. "In order that the power of the Hierarchy may be better understood, we must recollect that every State and Commonwealth, and therefore the Commonwealth of the Church, should be considered as a civil body. For there is this difference between an assembly of many and one body—that an assembly of itself does not form a single person out of many individuals; whereas a body constitutes a person, to which person may belong various properties and rights, distinct from the rights of the individuals; whence it is that the right of a body or college is vested in one individual, while that of an assembly is necessarily in the hands of many." [1] The Commonwealth has a will; likewise the Church. Because from the beginning the Holy Ghost was promised "to the consummation of the world," and "has been propagated throughout the whole body of the Church by the Bishops, as successors of the Apostles." But Bishops cannot meet continuously or even frequently in Council on account of their pastoral office, "while at the same time the person of the Church must always live and subsist"; therefore it was a necessary consequence "by the Divine Law itself insinuated in Christ's most memorable words to Peter . . . that one among the Apostles, and the successor of this one among the Bishops, was invested with pre-eminent power in order that by him, as the visible centre of unity, the body of the Church might be bound together; the common necessities be provided for; a Council, if necessary, be convoked, and when convoked, directed; and that, in the interval between Councils, provision might be made lest the Commonwealth of the faithful sustain injury." As S. Peter governed the Church, was martyred and appointed his successor in the City of Rome, "the capital of the world, we justly acknowledge the Bishop of Rome to be chief of all the rest." His power between the Convocations

[1] It is interesting to compare this with the theories of Gierke and Figgis.

of the General Councils is "the same as that of the whole Church." [1]

CHURCH AND STATE. "All this, however, is to be understood with reservation of the right of earthly powers, which Christ did not abolish; for though Christian princes owe obedience to the Church, no less than the very humblest of the faithful, yet, unless where the law of the realm appears to have provided and ordained otherwise, the ecclesiastical power should not be stretched so far as to arm subjects against their true lords; for the arms of the Church are tears and prayers. And the best and safest line of demarcation between the secular and ecclesiastical power is that drawn by the example of the Primitive Church—viz. that we are bound to obey God and His Ministers in preference to the secular power; nevertheless, that we must not resist earthly powers, but that, should they command what is unlawful, we must submit to any amount of suffering rather than obey the command, provided this can be done without certain injury to the Faith." Christian princes, however, are bound to bestow great care on spiritual matters, "but it must be in such a way as not to put their hand to the ark, or, like Osias [Uzziah], to take the Censer, but to content themselves with assisting the Church in more effectually preserving her purity and unity, and in using the right which she herself possesses." "If these principles be observed, Empire will subsist and flourish within Empire —the sacred Empire within the earthly—without mixture or confusion."

EPISCOPACY. The Church has no doubt about the distinction in Divine Law between the bishop and priest; but Protestants differ from the Church and from one another. "The Episcopalians in England and Scotland, as we know, defend the prerogative of Divine Privilege against the Presbyterians, by the authority of Scripture as well as that of the ancient Church." Christ drew a distinction between the Apostles and the rest of the disciples; the Church retained it, "and has always held that the Apostles constituted the Bishops their successors." What should be done in cases of extreme necessity is a matter of controversy, *e.g.* supposing that a Christian priest or even a layman is

[1] A promise, inserted here, to return to the subject later, is not fulfilled. Was it forgetfulness, or have we only a fragment of the "Systema"?

cast on a remote island and wins many to Christ by his preaching. "A question arises as to whether this priest can ordain other priests, in order that upon his death the new Christians may not be deprived of the benefit of the Sacraments, which are very necessary for salvation." It is said that Frumentius, while still a layman, did some things which were only excusable on these grounds. Again, if Frumentius, in his Mission to the Ethiopians, had not even been ordained priest, "the question is, whether through the prayers of the new Church to God he may promise from on high, for himself and others, the Grace of Priesthood, and of the Sacraments connected therewith." A passage in Tertullian suggests that some of the ancients believed that any layman could baptise or even offer the sacrifice in extreme necessity. "For my part, however, I do not think it either necessary or safe to define these questions by private authority. It is better to leave the supreme care of the Church, and of the souls of the people, to God . . . and not to depart from the line of ordination which, through the successors of the Apostles, has carried down the grace of the ministry to us, by uninterrupted propagation."

MATRIMONY. The Old Testament granted dispensations for polygamy and also for divorce, but the New Testament admonishes us that these dispensations were granted only because of the "hardness of men's hearts." What attitude are we to adopt towards the case of a nation which might be converted by the toleration of a long-established custom of polygamy? The matter should be left to the decision of the Pontiff; but should he be disposed to allow it he would in no way contravene the doctrine of Christ. To win China on these conditions would be a great boon to the Church. Divorce has many difficulties. Some take a very indulgent line; others admit at least two causes, adultery and desertion. Others hold that Divine Law admits no ground for the dissolution of marriage. "And the weight of authority at the present day is in favour of this opinion." Pious antiquity wavers on the subject, *e.g.* Ambrose says, "It is lawful for a man, if he have divorced a guilty wife, to marry another." There are other instances of indulgence. The rigid opinion of Augustine prevailed, however, and was confirmed by the Council of Trent, by

its anathema on those who say that the marriage bond can be broken by the adultery of either party. Some great men to-day hold the opposite view, and the intention of the Council was to state the Divine Law rather than to regulate practice. The Church has still the power to grant concessions for her great purpose of the salvation of souls. "If the Sovereign Pontiff had granted liberty of divorce to Henry VIII of England, and had sanctioned his contracting a new marriage with Anne . . . and if by this compliance he had preserved Henry's Kingdom to the Church (si olim Pontifex Maximus Henrico VIII, Angliæ Regi . . . divortii facultatem et novi cum Anna conjugii jus indulsisset, eaque facilitate Regnum Ecclesiæ conservasset); or if the Pope were now to receive the Chinese Empire into the Faith, by permitting it to retain the usage of polygamy, which in so vast a nation it would be impossible to abolish suddenly without the greatest revolutions; or even if the Pope, for a great cause, grants a dispensation in the degrees which regularly speaking are prohibited by the law of God and of the Church—in none of these cases do I think his power of dispensation can be denied, or his prudence censured, without rashness."

CELIBACY is more meritorious than marriage, because, by it, "the mind is at once more free for the contemplation of the things of heaven . . . and the offices of religion are performed with greater purity and worthiness." "The Church therefore, especially in the West, gradually tended towards, and eventually attained, the establishment of priestly celibacy." The Eastern Church has been more indulgent, and in the West there have been complaints from clergy and people. "And several pious Catholic princes earnestly pressed upon the Sovereign Pontiff and the Council of Trent the expediency of permitting the marriage of priests." Hitherto, however, there have been great reasons for not allowing this concession; now, however, we must trust God to do the best for his Church, and Protestants must not be impatient, remembering always that there are things which we must endure in human affairs for which no immediate remedy can be found.

The fourth part of the *Systema* deals with the Last Things. True philosophy and revelation demonstrate the immor-

tality of the soul. And not in the sense that the soul subsists only through Grace, nor that it sleeps at death only to be resuscitated on the Day of Judgment; because the soul is a substance, and no substance can perish except by a miracle of annihilation. The soul, moreover, has no parts and cannot be dissolved into several substances; therefore the soul is NATURALLY IMMORTAL. The characteristic and continuous activity of the soul is thought, by which, in its separated state, it retains a memory and consciousness of the events of the past life, so as to be capable of reward and punishment. Of anything else concerning the soul separated from the body we are entirely dependent on revelation.

Perdition follows naturally to a soul, which leaves the body in mortal sin; it "falls headlong into the gulf of perdition, as if of its own accord, like a weight which has once been detached, and is not afterwards arrested or stayed by an external cause." Origen is wrong in his belief in the eternal hope.

The Beatific Vision awaits the souls of the friends of God. Thought is confused on earth by the reflection and refraction due to corporeal qualities. But "as God is the ultimate reason of all things, it follows, as a consequence, that when our knowledge shall be a priori, through the cause of causes, we shall certainly see God; inasmuch as our demonstrations will then require neither hypotheses nor experiments, and we shall be able to give reasons, even to the primitive truths themselves."

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY seems to present difficulties to some people. "Suppose the case of a cannibal who has lived on human flesh all his life; what, it is asked, will remain to him when, like the flock of birds to the jackdaw in the fable, the victims shall come to him to claim their feathers; that is, when each one's flesh will return to its first owner? In order to understand this, however, we must be aware that it is false to say that everything which was ever united to a man's body belongs to its essence; for it is certain that our body is constantly in a state of change, constantly receiving and losing particles, and that were all the particles that ever belonged to us restored, we should be swelled to a thousandfold our actual bulk, and far more." "It might be said therefore that in

every man there is, so to speak, a certain 'flower of substance,' the nature of which may be illustrated from the principles of chemists; that this is preserved throughout these numerous changes; and that although it is contracted in infants, and in adults is expanded by the greater mass of assumed and variable matter which is put on, yet it always subsists, such as it was assigned to each at his birth, neither increased by aliments nor decreased by transpiration; and even though it be granted that this too is dissipated, yet as its value consists in its efficacy, and, as it were, in its seminal virtue and not in its bulk, it may be restored to each individual without loss to the rest. The cannibal, in the case supposed, therefore, will retain his own body, as will those also whom he devoured, without any confusion of the things which God assigned peculiar to each, which are diffused through the entire mass of the body and remain distinct from what is superadded and held in constant fluctuation."

PURGATORY. Protestants hold that the departed are consigned at once either to eternal happiness or to eternal misery. Hence they reject prayers for the dead as mere pious desires without any efficacy. But it is a most ancient belief of the Church that the dead are assisted by such prayers; and that those who have departed in Christ are particularly helped in their passage through Purgatory, where the last stains of evil are washed out. The mode of Purgatory is a matter of controversy; but "almost all (the holy Fathers) agree as to the existence . . . of a paternal chastisement or purgation after this life, to which the soul, enlightened at its parting from the body, and touched with extreme sorrow for the imperfection of its past life, and for the hideousness of sin—of which for the first time it becomes sensible—voluntarily subjects itself, insomuch that it would not desire to attain to supreme happiness on any other condition." We are to remember especially that it is a voluntary purgatory.

The MS. terminates abruptly with a comma in the following passage. "Among others there is a remarkable passage of Louis of Granada, which afforded great consolation to Philip II in his last illness," [1] . . . The abrupt

[1] Inter cæteros illustris est granatensis locus, qui Philippo II, in novissima ægritudine, magnam consolationem attulit,

termination and the unfulfilled promises to treat special subjects in a later portion of the work clearly show that the MS. is incomplete.

This unfinished document, without date, and with very little internal evidence to guide the critic, has been the subject of the most divergent opinions. When it was first published in Paris (1819) and at Mainz, soon after, with a German translation, the theologians showed their bewilderment by a series of contradictory and conflicting opinions, based rather on religious passion than on critical principles. The Catholics rejoiced at the discovery of the "secret Catholicism" of so great a man as Leibnitz, and expressed themselves freely, to the irritation of the Protestants, that the *Systema* was the true "religious testament" of Leibnitz. "They believed," says Guhrauer, "that they discerned in it the religious testament of Leibnitz, and his own peculiar convictions for posterity, while circumstances alone had prevented him from an open conversion to the Roman Church." [1]

The Protestants, at first, either denied the authenticity of the MS. altogether or took the alternative of denying the sincerity of the writer in the opinions which he expresses. In 1823 Landmann pronounced the work a fraud. "Undoubtedly it is impossible," he says, "that Leibnitz could have been the author of such a System. Have not the days yet gone by when men 'by pious fraud' sought to honour the Church but in reality dishonoured her? What a disgrace it is to the Church that, from time immemorial, spurious works have been published under the names of eminent men, and genuine works have been interpolated, in order to serve her purposes! What are we to think of a Church which needs such frauds to sustain it? To the honour of the Roman Church we may say that she has no real need of frauds like these." [2]

The better-informed theologians admitted the authenticity of the MS., but adopted some curious expedients for denying the sincerity of the writer. One says that it sprang from Leibnitz's innate love of paradox; it is a "mere

[1] Guhrauer, II. 31 f.
[2] *Allgemeiner Anzeiger der Deutschen*, 1823, Vol. I. p. 383.

exercise of his ingenuity and a trial of his powers in defending a system which to others appeared hardly defensible." [1] Another regards it as the result of a desire to imitate and rival the ingenuity of Bossuet (in *l'Exposition de la foi catholique*) in softening the offensive doctrines of the Catholic Church.[2] Again, the motive of the work is said to have been to satisfy the importunate zeal for his conversion, which the Landgrave Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels showed towards Leibnitz. The *System* was to prove that he was catholic in all but name.[3] Other less possible theories were promoted: that the work was to quieten the conscience of a German prince, probably Anton Ulrich of Brunswick, who had joined the Roman Church; [4] or that it originated in the negotiations for the establishment of a literary Academy in Vienna, and was intended to show, at the instigation of Linzendorf, the Chancellor, that Leibnitz was a Catholic in all but name to the influential members who were opposed to Protestant management.[5]

The authenticity of the MS. is universally accepted to-day, even by Protestants. It is not a matter for surprise that the earliest Protestant critics were overwhelmed by the curious nature of the *Systema*. But the accumulation of Leibnitz's theological works and the consequent knowledge of his early attempts to work for Reunion from a Catholic rather than from a Protestant standpoint have made it unnecessary for such an exhaustive scholar of Leibnitz as Guhrauer to make any allusion whatever to the early suspicions on the authenticity of the MS. It is in the autograph of Leibnitz; it is parallel in thought with the other writings of Leibnitz at this period; it was always regarded as the work of Leibnitz by his successors in the librarianship at the Court of Hanover. And Leibnitz makes reference to it himself in the following extracts from his correspondence. " Some time," he writes to the Landgrave in March 1684, " I want to draw up a document on some

[1] See J. K. L. Schlegel's *Neuere Kirchengeschichte der Hannov. Staaten*, Vol. III. p. 318.

[2] See G. Schulze, Prot. Prof. of Divinity at Göttingen, *Ueber die Entdeckung dass Leibnitz ein Katholik gewesen sey.*

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] M. Feder, Librarian of Hanover, in a letter to Emery, quoted by Guhrauer in *Deutsche Schriften*, Vol. II., App., p. 81 note.

[5] Neumann in the *Sophronizon*, Vol. V., Pt. V., p. 58 ff.

points of controversy between Catholics and Protestants, and if it meets the approval of the wise and tolerant I shall be very pleased. But it is unnecessary that anyone should know in any way that the author is not a member of the Roman Communion." [1] In two fragments of the first draft of a letter addressed to a prince, whose name is not mentioned, but who undoubtedly was Ernest Augustus of Hanover, Leibnitz speaks of a similar undertaking. The prince feels that the only question to be discussed is the question of authority; theological details are to be left out. " Excellent projects have frequently been marred because the parties engaged," writes Leibnitz, " although meaning well and having but one common end in view, counteracted each other, nevertheless, by disagreeing about the means to be employed. . . . The same thing occurs at this moment in the negotiation about the Peace of the Church. Your Serene Highness having conceived the idea of effecting it upon the basis of antiquity, and by the compendious method of the authority of a visible Church, appears to disapprove of our entering into the detail of controversies, and reproaches me with departing thereby from the true principles. For myself I can say that I have studied antiquity, and that I entertain infinite esteem for a tradition of the Catholic Church; nevertheless I have deemed it of importance, not indeed for everyone, but for those who are capable of the inquiry, to unite therewith an exact discussion of the separate subjects, in order that we may have nothing to reproach ourselves with hereafter, and that we may act throughout with all possible *sincerity and precision*, without concealment or dissimulation." [2] A more direct reference to the *Systema* occurs in the other fragment of the letter; referring to special doctrines of controversy, like Transubstantiation and the Doctrine of Grace, he decides that " it would be necessary that a man of meditative mind, and one whose views are not far removed from the reunion, should draw up an EXPOSITION OF FAITH, A LITTLE MORE DETAILED THAN THAT OF MONSEIGNEUR THE BISHOP OF CONDAM, in which he should endeavour to explain himself with the utmost exactness and *sincerity* on the disputed articles, avoiding all equivocal phrases and

[1] Rommel, II. 28. [2] Guhrauer, II. 30, 31.

all the terms of scholastic chicanery, and employing only natural forms of expression." "The Exposition he should submit to the judgment of some learned bishops (of the Roman Church) distinguished for moderation; dissembling, however, his own name and party. And, in order to enable them to judge more favourably, the question proposed should be, not whether they themselves agree with the writer in his opinions, but simply whether they hold his opinions to be tolerable in their Church." The "Exposition" here referred to is without doubt the *Systema Theologicum*.[1]

Later critics, who had a greater number of sources at their disposal, and were convinced of the authenticity of the MS., limited their criticism to its date and, what was more important, to its motive.

Guhrauer [2] represents the best Protestant opinion up to the year 1850. From the extremely sparse internal evidence he fixes the date of the MS. as 1686 (from the allusion to the death of the celebrated chemist, John Joachim Becher, in the previous year (?)). Its aim was to explain Catholic beliefs to Protestants in the most favourable sense possible, and thus to promote the project of Reunion. "This work," he says, "still remains instructive and worthy of great consideration by the philosopher and the theologian. It forms in a certain measure the high-water mark of the Spinola Reunion negotiations." At a moment when Reunion seemed imminent Leibnitz puts his pen to paper in order to explain Roman doctrines in the most favourable light; the motive is therefore that of a diplomatist rather than that of a theologian. Great care must be taken in deciding the question as to which are the personal and peculiar views of Leibnitz and which not.

Russell's introduction to the *Systema* is almost entirely a translation of Guhrauer. The author does not seem to have wandered outside the circumference drawn by his clever contemporary in Breslau. He works over Guhrauer's facts, corrects obvious errors, and states his own results. He has made a solid contribution to the question of the *date* of the *Systema*. Guhrauer misdated the death of the chemist Becher, who died in London 1682 and was buried

[1] Guhrauer, II. 31.
[2] *Biog.*, II. 31 ff.; *Anmerkungen*, II. 71; *Deutsche Schriften*, II. 65–80.

there in October of the same year (not 1685).[1] As he died, according to the *Systema*, in the previous year to its composition, the date is fixed at late 1683 or early in 1684. The fact that Bossuet is called Bishop of Meaux shows that it is not earlier than 1682;[2] and it cannot be later than 1689, because Innocent XI is referred to as still alive.[3] The reference to the downfall of the "Mahomedan domination"[4] seems to fix the time of composition between 1683 or 1684, when the twenty years' truce was concluded with the Turks, and 1689, when all hope of a union of Christian Powers against them was abandoned. The date is most likely between the years 1683 and 1689. The work for Reunion at the Court of Hanover makes it "more natural to refer it to the years 1684 or 1685, whilst the project was still somewhat hopeful, than to the later years, when it had begun to languish, and was regarded by Leibnitz himself as indefinitely postponed, if not, indeed, utterly lost."[5] On a later page, however, Russell concludes: "On a full consideration of all the circumstances, the date may, with much probability, be fixed in the end of the year 1683 or the beginning of 1684,"[6] and this meets all the facts.

The motive is discussed at considerable length. The far-fetched theories mentioned above are discarded as without evidence; the Roman Catholic theory—"namely, that the work was drawn up as a private record of the creed which the author in his heart believed, but which the circumstances of his position prevented him from rendering public"[7]—is reluctantly abandoned in the light of Leibnitz's patent Protestantism. Professor Schulze of Göttingen is said to have given the key to the lock, which holds the secret of the *Systema*. He conjectured that the object of Leibnitz was "to secure from Protestants a favourable consideration for the proposals then pending for a Union

[1] Russell, p. xc; cf. Dutens, I. 367. Doctor Joannes Joachimus Beccherius Medicus Germanicus . . . natus est Beccherius Spiræ, A. 1635, denatus Londin., A. 1682, mense Oct.

[2] Russell, p. xcviii. Et episcopus Meldensis cujus aurea extat fidei expositio. (Foucher's edit., I. 594.)

[3] *Ibid.* Extant complures Bullæ præclaræ Summorum Pontificum, ut Urbani VIII et Innocentii XI quorum ille eruditionis, hic pietatis eximia laude celebrantur (Foucher, I. 592.)

[4] *Ibid.* Deo Christianorum armis vel potius prædicationibus favente, cum fatalis aderit Mahumeticæ tyrannidi dies. (Foucher, I. 575.)

[5] *Ibid.*, p. xcix. [6] *Ibid.*, p. cxxxvi. [7] *Ibid.*, p. cxxxvii.

with the Catholic Church, by a better representation of its doctrines and its practices."[1] Russell develops his position from this main thesis. The letters in which Leibnitz makes reference to the *Systema* confirm it. Something, however, occurred to prevent the submission of the document to certain "learned and moderate bishops of the Roman Church"; the MS. is a rough draft with erasures and alterations, omitting many important controversies like those on the Rule of Faith, the sufficiency of Holy Scripture, the Canon, Tradition, and even that of the Authority of the Church itself; it shows signs of haste, and yet it breaks off in the middle of a sentence with a comma. Something seems to have interrupted the writing of the work, as it was abandoned and not published at the time. It was certainly to be published anonymously, and, if the correspondence quoted above can be relied on, it was not to be communicated to anyone except the parties immediately interested in the negotiations. The author's party was to be kept a secret; above all that he was a Protestant; the neutral tone is retained throughout and any sign of revealing the secret is quickly erased (*e.g.* nec vero irritæ sunt protestationes ~~nostrorum~~ (erased); "ut Protestantibus ægre faciamus" changed to "ut adversariis ægre faciamus"; "Calvinianis" to "heterodoxis").

In such a curious work the supreme question is how far the author was sincere. His own letters prove that he was seeking a method of Reunion, starting from the Roman Catholic point of view, and endeavouring to ascertain how far the opinions of the writer and of those who acted with him would be held tolerable in the Church of Rome. He would approach Rome as closely as he could. But did he mean all he wrote? or was it merely a matter of diplomacy? Russell concludes: "Without contending for the sincerity of Leibnitz in the absolute and literal maintenance of every opinion in the work, I am inclined, after a careful review of all that has been written or collected on the subject, to think that the truth lies between the extreme opinions." In the composition of the work he unquestionably practised a certain degree of dissimulation. He modified some of his expressions and probably also some of his views, in order that "the work might not appear to come from a Protestant."

[1] Russell, p. cxxxix.

Yet he must have been sincere in his aim of finding a basis of Reunion between Protestants and Catholics, and the terms which he sets forth must be regarded as a sincere basis of Reunion. Probably the best way of regarding them is under the distinction which he frequently draws between doctrines which are true in themselves and doctrines which are tolerable. "This supposition will enable us to reconcile many seeming contradictions, and will leave the general sincerity and trustworthiness of the *System of Theology* entirely free from suspicion." [1]

Russell accepted the opinion of Guhrauer, but modified it in favour of Leibnitz's sincerity against the diplomacy theory of the German biographer.

Foucher has added further facts for a critical judgment of the *Systema*. He deals entirely with the motive and makes no reference to the date of the work (except to say, without giving evidence, "vers 1684").[2] But for the motive he considers that a pamphlet, entitled "Projet de M. Leibniz pour finir les controverses de religion," is the key.[3] It contains certain rules for putting an end to the controversies, of which Nos. 2 and 3 are the most important. Rule 2. The task of bringing about an understanding is delegated to one "who shall be neither judge, nor party, nor conciliator, but a reporter." Rule 3 gives the qualifications of the "reporter." "No one shall be able to find out which side he himself takes . . . this being an evident sign of his moderation and fairness." On the basis of these rules Foucher makes fun of his co-religionists. "If editors and interpreters, in short all those who, in pious but over-ardent zeal, have built on this sole foundation of the *Systema Theologicum* the hope of a conversion . . . had had this little paragraph (rule 3) of his (Leibnitz's) 'Scheme for terminating Religious Controversies' under their eyes, they would not have given weapons to Protestant criticism, which has refuted them victoriously by dates, by the study of the text, and above all by these little unobserved facts which are the salt of criticism." [4] The *Systema* can only be rightly interpreted according to the above rules. "Leibnitz . . . is merely a reporter, with no fixed conclusions"; his rôle was impartial and impersonal. Ten years later he

[1] Russell, p. cliii.
[2] Foucher, I. xxxviii.
[3] *Ibid.*, 91.
[4] *Ibid.*, xxxix.

adopted the same method in a work known as "Judicium doctoris catholici de tractatu reunionis cum quibusdam protestantibus nuper habito." The *Systema* is therefore "a document of small worth for revealing to us the soul of Leibnitz, but of great value for knowledge of the history of these delicate negotiations. It is of undoubted authenticity." [1]

Pichler adds further light on the subject by placing the *Systema* in its political environment. "I say," writes Pichler with assurance, "that the work has had above all a political aim. It was to certify to the whole Catholic world that the religious pretext for the Conversion of Heretics by which France continually justified her rapacious attacks on Germany . . . had no foundation, since the Protestants were ready to accept all, provided they received a just measure of moderation, and concessions were made to them from the Catholic side, without prejudice to their own honour, while, above all, a future General and universally recognised Council may deal with detailed determinations." [2] The *Systema* belongs in this respect to the same category as *Projet pour faciliter la Réunion* and the *Rélation pour la Cour Impériale;* works which were written for the Emperor with the aim of showing that Protestants, and especially those of the Court of Hanover, were ready to seek a means of reconciliation with Rome. "As long as the Catholic States in Europe and in Germany had still the political supremacy, a man like Leibnitz, who was a politician and theologian, could only strive to portray Catholicism in the best colours possible to the Protestant Party, so as to show that it contained nothing unchristian," and thus to help forward national unity. "From this standpoint the *Systema Theologicum* and Leibnitz's whole Apologetic [3] in general for Catholicism is to be explained." The general aim of standing well in the presence of the great Roman Catholic States, and the more particular aim of showing France that there was no justification for attack on religious grounds, are both reconcilable under the greatest aim of the political plans of Leibnitz—the creation of a national consciousness.

[1] Foucher, I. p. xliv., but see p. 41 for Foucher's opinion of Leibnitz's general sincerity.

[2] Pichler, I. 192.

[3] *Ibid.*, 163.

With this motive in view, the *Systema* subordinates everything to the fundamental truths of Christianity; great concessions can then be made to Catholic opinion, and the unity of Christendom and of the nation are advanced. This may seem to show that Leibnitz was not sincere in his work. But we must "reject this opinion entirely. Leibnitz is in deep earnest in the views which he expressed at that time." [1]

Pichler adds further results of his investigations, but without giving any clear grounds for his conclusions. The *Systema* is not a fragment but a complete whole. It was composed between September 1687 and September 1688, or "from the victory of the Emperor over the Turks at Mohacz to the War Manifesto of France against Austria." [2] It is quite possible that Leibnitz composed it before his long journey, in order to present it to the Emperor on his arrival in Vienna, where he stayed many months before going on to Italy and Rome. The very careful Latin style shows that the Emperor was to submit it to the opinion of certain bishops and theologians. It is quite likely that Leibnitz presented the document himself to the Emperor; or otherwise that he employed the services of Bishop Spinola for this purpose.[3]

At first sight it seems hopeless to attempt constructive and helpful criticism of a document which has produced so many varied and often contradictory views. But the task is not as hopeless as it seems.

At the outset the MS., discovered as it was among the effects of Leibnitz, as well as answering all the requirements demanded by the best critics, must be accepted as authentic.

The date has been carefully dealt with by Russell, and his arguments are on the whole sound. We may only

[1] Pichler, I. 191. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 191, 192.

[3] Another opinion on the *Systema* is expressed by Rommel, I. 231. Ernest Augustus is said to have been opposed to the "Regulæ" as dangerous. Leibnitz felt that it was necessary to find a method of reaching agreement on doctrinal grounds, and not merely on preliminaries of Reunion. "Zu diesem Behuf entwarf er nicht in seinem Namen sondern unter dem Schein eines römischen Katholiken, nach dem Beispiel Bossuets eine philosophische Erklärung der schwierigsten Glaubenslehren des positiven Christenthums, der Trinität, der Transsubstantiation, u.s.f., worin er zeigen wollte, dass selbst die streng-katholischen Dogmen zwar Geheimnisse aber keine Widersprüche enthaltend, zur Beförderung der Andacht angewandt werden könnten."

add the evidence of the letters to the Landgrave in 1684. It looks as though Leibnitz was employed on the work during that very year, because he mentions it twice in the same year in his correspondence with the Landgrave and on no other known occasion. The second time, he speaks of the declaration which it would be necessary to make before Rome would give her approval to the admission of Protestants. "But in order that such a declaration may be more readily received," he writes (1684), "one might avail oneself of an 'addresse innocente' by writing a treatise which does not seem to come from a member of another Communion." [1]

A clear idea of the motives behind the *Systema* is imperative. Pichler gives no evidence for his belief that the work was intended to curb the French aggression in the Rhineland, under the pretext of religion; much less can he point to any basis for his belief that the work was presented to the Emperor, and through him to a body of theologians and bishops. If such a presentation had taken place, would the world have been ignorant of the document for so many years? Could there possibly have been only one solitary MS.—and that unfinished—of a work which had been submitted by an Emperor to his bishops in the cause of Reunion, so dear to the Emperor's heart? At least it might have been expected that Leibnitz would complete his work before it was presented to His Majesty.

But Pichler has voiced a new note in proclaiming the utter sincerity of the writer against a host of editors and others, who have tried to solve the enigma of the *Systema* by a theory of "dissimulation" or "diplomacy." He was able to do this because no writer before him had made such a thorough investigation of the development of the theology of Leibnitz. (His early and late thought are strangely separated.[2]) And because he realised that when Foucher published the *Rélation pour la Cour Impériale* and kindred works on the Spinola negotiations, he was giving to the world the earlier and more Catholic standpoint of Leibnitz. Guhrauer was without these documents and held no theory of development. His static view of Leibnitz led him to promote a theory of "diplomacy" by which the views

[1] Rommel (II. 36) thinks that this refers to the *Systema*.
[2] See pp. 266 ff.

expressed in the *Systema* are to be treated with caution. Russell accepted the same theory, but modified it by saying that in general though not in particular the sincerity of the *Systema* was free from suspicion. Foucher laughed at his Roman Catholic brethren for taking Leibnitz seriously, and propounded a theory which depersonalised the *Systema* at a stroke.[1] But the rules on which he bases his argument are no doubt among the early works of Leibnitz at Hanover and savour more of the study than of practical events. Foucher forgets that when Leibnitz wrote his *Systema* the practical question of Reunion was occupying the best minds at Court and that the MS. cannot be relegated to any other conditions. The *Systema* has first and foremost some deep connection with the Spinola negotiations.

What is this connection? When the "Regulæ" were drawn up towards the end of 1683, it was clear that something more must be done before Reunion could be guaranteed. "These rules . . . cannot be said to form a plan of union, but are, in fact, little more than preliminary principles, intended rather as a guide in the selection of the controversies to be adjusted, and the course to be followed in adjusting them, than as an attempt to arrange the controversies themselves." There was great need of an "Exposition," written with a view to mediating between the theologies of the two great parties—a theology for the new united Church. And this need was to be supplied by the *Systema*. What other meaning can be gathered from the letters to the Prince, in which Leibnitz expresses the need of turning to theological and doctrinal details instead of leaving the whole matter to a discussion on the question of authority? What more emphatic allusion could be made to such a need than that contained in the second part of the letter, where an Exposition of Faith is called for on the

[1] Foucher says that he was put on his guard by the reference in Leibnitz to his "adresse (Rommel spells "addresse") innocente" by which he would put the French bishops off the track. He thinks the rules confirm his suspicion. But does the 3rd rule imply what Foucher thinks it does? The true conciliator is to be a "rapporteur," *i.e.* he must be without prejudice one way or the other. It has no suggestion of "trimming." There is so much evidence against "diplomacy" and "dissimulation" that even the "harmless device" of writing a treatise under the guise of a Catholic implies that the Protestant is all but Catholic in sympathies. Moreover, Foucher has left the rest of the evidence out of account. He bases his argument solely on the rules disclosed by an early treatise.

same lines as that of the Bishop of Condam—a conciliating Exposition between Catholics and Protestants, based on sincerity and straightforward expression? The *Systema* is the complement of the "Regulæ."

Why did it remain unfinished and unpublished? There can be only one reason: the aim for which it was written had lost point. The great possibilities of Reunion had become eclipsed and public opinion throughout Germany was so disturbed by the "Catholicism" of men like Molanus and himself that he felt it imperative to keep silence. In referring to the *Systema* as a Declaration of Faith, submitted to the Roman Church for approval, he adds, "I believe that the only expedient for success . . . would be that which I have mentioned above, demanding as it does absolute silence until the above-mentioned approval has finally been given." [1] But it is doubtful whether it was ever presented for approval. Everything seems to point to the fact that the Reunion Movement was too unpopular to warrant a continuation of the MS. The Landgrave Ernest speaks for the majority in Germany in a letter dated at the time, which might most likely be fixed as the date when Leibnitz put down his pen in despair or disgust. "I hear no more of the work of the Bishop of Tina," writes the Landgrave. After voicing the opinion of many Lutherans that Spinola has been trifling with them for the purpose of creating division, he adds: "It is perfectly certain that, on the side of Rome, it is impossible to yield even the smallest point in essentials." [2] The purpose of the MS. was foiled.

The great problem of the *Systema* remains. Is its "Catholicism" sincere? The profession of sincerity in the letter to the unnamed prince seems to answer in the affirmative. The more personal professions in the correspondence of Leibnitz with the Landgrave amply confirm that view. Consider his view of the Pope in a letter dated 1680. "I confess," he writes, "that piety and prudence are not sufficient qualities for a Pope . . . he needs still more the necessary authority"; obedience to the Pope is only a profession of words on the mouths of contemporaries; even the clergy are not one with him; the respect of the people is also lost; it would be better to add all Italy to his patrimony and that he should be "in some way judge

[1] Rommel, II. 37. [2] *Ibid.*, 50.

of the controversies of Christian princes" rather than that Papal prestige should be damaged. In these times, he feels "it is necessary rather to increase than to diminish the power of the Pope." [1] In January 1684, just before the *Systema* seems to have been written, Leibnitz made the most startling reference to the authority of Rome. "The man who wants to be a member of the Church by this inner Communion," he writes in relation to his central idea, "must make every possible effort to be likewise a member of the Church by the outer Communion of the visible Catholic Church, identified by the continuous succession of its Hierarchy, such as, in my opinion, is that we call Roman—the Hierarchy found there, namely the supremacy of the supreme Pontiff, is based on ordinary Divine Right, since bishops and priests require an Overseer. I indeed add that the visible Church is infallible on all those points of belief which are necessary to salvation by the special help of the Holy Spirit, which was granted to her." [2] Rommel has truly named this the "culmination of Leibnitz's Concessions to Rome." Many other quotations might be made from the correspondence of Leibnitz at this time in favour of the "Catholic" tendency of his thought.

A few quotations from his other works would help, however, to strengthen the view that the *Systema* expresses the sincere opinion of the author; but this has been done so admirably by Russell that there is no need to repeat it. There are parallels to the most extreme passages of the *Systema* in the rest of Leibnitz's works.

The *Systema* is therefore a revelation to the student of Christian irenics. This abandoned and unfinished work opens to the whole world the mind of Leibnitz at a time when hopes for Reunion with Rome were high. It is the generous response of a great soul to the crying need of the Church of his age. With the bitter memories of religious war and hatred behind him, and with a vision of a united Church before him, he proclaimed his message of conciliation in a work which has astonished all scholars, who have tried in patience to understand it. Molanus and his colleagues had ventured a long way to meet the messenger on his way from Rome; Leibnitz was willing to go still further if he could grasp the prize of Reunion when, a year

[1] Rommel, I. 284 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, II. 19.

later, it seemed so near. Of the great matters of controversy he had written only on the Papacy and the Eucharist; what he would have said at that time on the much controverted questions of the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture, of the Canon, of Tradition, and even of the authority of the Church itself we are not able to say with clear accuracy; because, ere he had reached them, the cause of Reunion waned among a hard and intolerant people; he put down his pen and turned for consolation and renewed efforts after unity to his personal correspondence. The *Systema Theologicum* stands, however, as a witness to the spirit of reconciliation which was innate in the mind of Leibnitz; it is the closest approach that Protestantism has ever made to Rome; it is the key to the secret thoughts of Leibnitz when Spinola was carrying out his negotiations in Hanover.

CHAPTER V

THE CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE LANDGRAVE ERNEST OF HESSEN-RHEINFELS AND MONS. PELISSON

Es ist ein fürstlicher Rath aus Niedersachsen, so sich mit Schriften in der Welt bekannt gemacht, und mehrere particularia selbst melden wird, Mit dem ich Geräume Zeit Correspondirt, anjetzo aber seine Gegenwart en passant genossen u.s.f.—Letter of Introduction from Ernest to the Elector Palatine, 4 Dec. 1687 (Guhrauer, *Anmerkungen*, II. 7).

Je suis d'autant plus sensible pour mon particulier, à la perte que nous avons faite dans la morte de M. Pelisson que j'ai joui bien peu de tems d'une si belle et si importante connaissance. Il pouvoit rendre de grands services au public, et ne manquoit pas de lumières ni l'ardeur; et il y avoit sans doute bien peu de gens de sa force. Mais enfin il faut s'en remettre à Dieu qui sçait choiser le tems et les instrumens de ses desseins, comme bon lui semble. . . . Pour moi, si j'ai cru que M. Pelisson se trompoit en certains points de Réligion, je ne l'ai jamais cru hypocrite.—Letter of Leibnitz to Bossuet, 29 March, 1693 (Dutens, I. 548).

Leibnitz had accepted the conclusions of the Spinola negotiations as a splendid opportunity for restoring unity to the Church; he had been prepared, had circumstances shown themselves favourable, to accept a mediating theology, of a generous and conciliatory kind, for the future reunited Church; although his theology remained a secret, it was well known that he was extremely tolerant towards Catholicism,[1] and he was soon engaged in a remarkable correspondence with the wise and thoughtful Catholic Landgrave of Hessen-Rheinfels. This correspondence reveals an intimate and personal view of the opinions of Leibnitz on Reunion as well as throwing much light on the project for Reunion itself. In fact, Rommel has emphasised the central interest of the correspondence in a striking

[1] Er ist zwar in foro externo nicht katholisch, aber sonsten in controversiis fidei wohl erfahren, et non procul a Regno Dei, und gewiss nicht vor die Protestirende Parthey gegen die unsrige, sondern vielmehr solcher wohl zugethan.—P.S. to Letter of Introduction to Elector Palatine, 4 Dec. 1687 (Guhrauer, *Anmerkungen*, II. 8).

passage: "We hope," he says, "to convince the reader that the respect and admiration, which the philosopher paid to the prince, had a deep foundation, which has not up to now been sufficiently appreciated. It was the great religious idea of the Reunion of the Churches . . . which brought them together and formed an essential basis of their correspondence." [1]

English readers require an introduction to the Landgrave (*b.* 1623, *d.* 1693). He was the son of the celebrated Landgrave Maurice, the political ally of Henry IV and of the Republic of Geneva. His mother was Juliane of Nassau, the second wife of the Landgrave, and, like him, a zealous supporter of the principles of the Reformation. There were eighteen children by the two marriages. The sons entered military service and experienced the bitterness of the Thirty Years' War, under the banner of Gustavus Adolphus. Philip, the eldest son of Juliane, fell in the battle of Königslutter; Maurice died young after a short but exciting military career (1633); Frederick fell before the Polish city of Kosten (1655); Christian died at Hildesheim under strange circumstances (1640); Herman alone seems to have had a normal existence in a country distraught by war; he died in 1658 at Rotenberg, leaving Ernest as heir to Hessen-Rheinfels.

To the sufferings of his brothers, the new Landgrave added the experience of watching his father's policy undermined. With the changing fortunes of the Thirty Years' War, the schools, seminaries, colleges, theatres of the country had disappeared. Hesse became a desert, by the ruin of all the provincial towns and of 300 villages. The national militia was destroyed and the spirit of the country was broken. The early years of Ernest were therefore spent under a cloud which only time could remove.

Under such conditions the Calvinism of his early training was of the most extreme kind. He has described it with his own pen. Theology was the central subject of his early education. Three times a day was he compelled to take his part in prayer, hymn-singing and in Bible reading, and to listen to a sermon on Wednesdays and Fridays with two on Sundays. The Heidelberg catechism and 200 verses from the Bible were to be learned by rote. No letters were

[1] Rommel, I. 12.

to be written on Sundays, and no secular author might be read. Under this training he read the Bible through no less than thirty times in the course of his life.

His Calvinism gave him a strong love for the Huguenots. At Charenton, he frequently took Communion at the hands of their clergy. He read their books of devotion with delight, especially *La Pratique de Piété* and *La Sonde de la Conscience*.

One of the problems of biography centres round the mental and spiritual change which began to take hold of this youth of fourteen years. After all the bitter experiences of the Thirty Years' War and the passionate hatred which he must have felt for Rome and the Jesuits, and after the smashing of his father's policy and the devastation of the whole country, it is surprising to read that this boy paid a visit to the Vice-Legate at Avignon, stayed to the Canonical Hours and the singing of the Psalms with the Parisian Carthusians, avoiding only the Mass, lest he should be obliged to kneel to the Host. It was more than curiosity; it was the birth of that large spirit of tolerance, which was native to the soul of the Landgrave.

In 1641 his military career commenced, as a volunteer in the siege of the Fortress Aire in Artois and Baupaume in Picardy. He rose to the rank of cavalry colonel in a few years, and did such good work in the Battle of Allerheim (1645), where he stood beside Condé and Turenne, that the King of France sent him a letter of thanks and a gift of 6000 livres, which was followed later, in 1662, by a gold chain set with diamonds. His bravery in the battle nearly cost him his life. Among his other experiences it is worth remembering that he was a prisoner to the Emperor in Paderborn for some seven weeks during the war.

Probably the deepest instincts of his personality were satisfied more in the camp than on the battlefield. He had a profound love for religious conversation. On one occasion the Duke of Holstein asked the Jesuit Father Schott what was the Jesuit idea on the difference between Lutherans and Calvinists. The Landgrave was present when the Jesuit answered that he saw no difference except that between an ugly old woman and an old woman who was not pretty. On many occasions throughout his military training, and

on his journeys to Rome, Vienna, Paris, Venice, he showed his tolerant and conciliatory spirit by opening out a religious conversation with people of opposite schools of thought from himself. This extreme sensibility to religious impressions made him a splendid object of Jesuit propaganda.

After the Peace of Westphalia the Landgrave gave himself up to the solution of the grave problem which lay behind the Thirty Years' War. In letters (1649) to the Hessen-Cassel Court Preacher, Crocius, a pronounced Calvinist, he expressed his horror at the schism in the Church. He had lived long enough to see men, who called themselves Christians, strike each other down in religious passion and deny to each other the hope of salvation; "readily would he give his life for the Reunion of the Holy Catholic Christian Church." [1] On all sides there was a call to deal with the problem; the state of Germany was reflected in the murder of Charles I of England. The Papal Nuncio, Archbishop of Capua, the two brothers Walenberg, and especially the Capucin General Valerianus Magnus, saw their opportunity to advise the Landgrave. At their instigation an invitation went out (dated 29 August, 1651) to three of the most celebrated Protestant theologians—George Calixtus of Helmstadt, John Crocius of Cassel, and Peter Haberkorn of Giessen—to a theological conference at Frankfort-on-Main. Three Capucins, with Valerian at the head, were to meet them. The conference did not take place, however; a new conference was proposed in which Haberkorn, with two Protestant assistants, Mentzer and Happel, met the three Capucins (Dec. 3, 1651).

Religious conversions are all hidden in mystery. It is clear that the Landgrave was instinctively open to new religious views, and that he was particularly open to the proselytism of the Jesuits; his early and emphatic Calvinism was bound to suffer a reaction in the tempests of the Thirty Years' War; but these facts are insufficient to explain the mystery of his conversion. It is sufficient to notice that the Landgrave and his wife made public confession of the Roman Faith soon after the Conference (on 6 Jan., 1652) in Cologne Cathedral, before a representative gathering of Catholic princes. Two Jesuits accompanied the converts back to Rheinfels, and the usual difficulties were

[1] Rommel, I. 54.

experienced in the establishment of a new form of service. The Town Council and the Protestant clergy protested; but with his usual courtesy and good sense the Landgrave won a quiet victory over all opposition. He informed Pope Innocent XI that he had passed from the darkness of Calvinism into the wonderful light of Catholic truth; he also advised the Emperor Ferdinand III and all his personal relatives of his conversion. One interesting sentence from his correspondence with his brother Herman throws light on the problem of his conversion. "He had," he writes, "an initial hope that Reunion would come on the basis of the principles of Calixtines, but afterwards he had seen that there were only two directions for Christians to take: one being that of authority and fixed agreement, and the other that of human wit and private interpretation"; "he had seen that in the latter case there was no security for the Faith, and that no other means of Reunion were at all practicable except that of ascribing perpetual infallibility to the Universal Church, resident at Rome."[1] If the supreme motive of his conversion is sought we are bound to find it here in his overmastering passion for the unity of the Church.

What other conclusion can be drawn from the contents of the *Conversionis ad fidem Catholicam motiva Ernesti H.L.*, which was published in Cologne in 1652 under the authority of the Papal Nuncio, and with the family escutcheon of the House of Hesse at the head of it? Protestantism is attacked on four points, all of which relate to the disintegrating nature of the Churches of the Reformation. They are marked off from the true Church by (1) their variety of doctrine, worship and discipline, by (2) their need of a constant witness to the Faith throughout the ages, by (3) their failure to give rest to the souls of their adherents, as the latest efforts for Reunion prove, and by (4) the approach of the Calixtins to the most Catholic doctrine and teaching.[2] The Landgrave needed the Catholicity of Rome, though occasionally he was led to attack her lack of Apostolicity.

[1] Rommel, I. 66.

[2] The original words are (1) Pluralitas Protestantium reddit eorum coetus suspectos, (2) De perpetua probatione fidei per testes, (3) De pacificis vera pace destitutis, (4) De appropinquatione Protestantium ad doctrinam Catholicorum, as headings of the chapters.

He made Reunion his supreme aim and subordinated everything else to it.

A sincere conversion at a time when religion so often served politics, and a character of true tolerance which would not stoop to coarse and overbearing methods for the conquest of his opponents, made him the cherished correspondent of many Protestants. Calixtus, Spener, David Christiani, Ludolphi, Cocceius, Ulrich, Jean Daillé, Charles Drelincourt, J. L. Fabricius[1] and others are numbered among those who received letters from him; but to Leibnitz the mind and outlook of the Landgrave were a revelation. Here was one who had passed through the fires of the Thirty Years' War, and who had experienced every phase of religious thought and who was by temperament conciliatory and fair to his opponents; a man whom his biographer has described in the following words: "An exquisite mind was the basis of his humanity, courtesy, kindness and placability in every tendency to sudden anger, the source of his sincere hatred of cheap flattery and calumny . . . and of his religious tolerance in spite of increasing efforts on his part to convert Protestants of every sect." From April 1680 to May 1693 (with a long gap from July or August 1688 to April 21, 1690, when Leibnitz was on travel) Leibnitz and the Landgrave held a correspondence, which for sincerity of aim if not for success in practical results cannot be equalled in the history of Irenics.

When Leibnitz was looking forward to the second visit of Spinola to the Court of Hanover he remembered a book which had helped him in similar circumstances at the Court of Mainz. It was none other than *The Genuine, Sincere and Discreet Catholic*,[2] written in 1660 by the Landgrave himself. On its publication, the book created a storm of disapproval among the Catholic ranks; the author was called a Calvinist by some and a Rationalist by others. On the other side, Count Ludwig of Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst wrote to him and said that he would have recognised the authority of the Roman Church long since on the terms set forth in the book. There is no evidence to show how the book was received at Rome, or what the Landgrave suffered at the hands of his Jesuit friends or during his sojourn with the Cardinals at

[1] For the significance of these men see Rommel, I. 69, 70.
[2] Rommel, I. 111.

Rome. He was at any rate a Gallican before the King of France.

The book had a dual aim: to win the Protestants back to the true fold, and to strip Catholicism of its obvious abuses. He calls Protestants from their endless divisions and sects to the unity of the Catholic Church, and criticises the Reformation as the destruction of authority in the Church. Catholics, however, must recognise the value of the devotion and reality of Protestant worship; of their attitude to the reading and practice of Holy Writ, of their work for education; the influence of their preaching and of their Church discipline must also be recognised. It is vain to attack Protestant gatherings as "lewd nocturnal assemblies" [1] or their preachers as "vagabond tailors or shoemakers." [2] The way to Reunion lies in another direction; Rome must remove the undeniable abuses in her practice, and uproot the exaggerated ideas of her blind and fanatical adherents. First among these abuses and exaggerations comes "the excessive opulence and abuse of spiritualities, the temporal power of the clergy and the despotism of the Pope." It would be impossible, nor is it necessary, to return to the primitive poverty of the Apostles, but the early ideal of the Shepherd must replace the false system of worldly gain. If the Pope would set aside the Territorial Power which he received from the Emperor; if the College of Cardinals consisted of wise, devout theologians chosen from all nations and returned to the primitive purpose for which they were instituted, the Church would have an influence over officers of State as well as over the clergy; if each bishopric of the Roman Church was limited to a diocese of 200 parishes, with a revenue of 5000 thalers (there are bishoprics of 2000 parishes and of 30,000 thalers revenue); if the bishops were obliged to remain in their dioceses, the canons in their foundations, the monks in their monasteries, each man to his own proper duty; if the most useless of the monastic Orders were allowed to perish, and other abuses were corrected, a great step would have been taken towards the reform of the Roman clergy.

The question of the infallibility of the Pope is treated with great enlightenment. The Landgrave rejects the Protestant and democratic principle which makes no distinction

[1] Rommel, I. 115. [2] *Ibid.*, 116.

between bishops and Priests; he acknowledges further the need of a visible Head and Chief Shepherd as the successor of S. Peter; but he warns his readers against an exaggerated idea of the functions of the Vicar of Christ. In essential matters the Church and not the Pope possesses the power of infallibility; the Apostles' Creed makes no mention of belief in the Pope but in the Holy Catholic Church, the true repository of Apostolic tradition. The best sign of infallibility is practical fact; and by this test the Popes prove their fallibility. Many of them were averse to sound theology, busy with worldly concerns, dependent on Italian interests. Others were in error or heresy and took partial views of Church affairs. (It is natural that the Landgrave should rejoice ever the Gallican propositions of 1682, and venture to boast to his Jesuit friend Jobert that he had proposed the very propositions twenty years before in his *Discreet Catholic*.)

The second source of corruption in the Roman Church lies in the lack of religious education and of preaching. The Landgrave confesses that it is impossible to produce sound religious knowledge in people ignorant of reading, poor and occupied in manual labour; nor would it be advisable to place the whole Bible in the hands of every unintelligent person. The effort of some bishops in Germany, the Netherlands and in France, of allowing their people special chapters, with the help of catechisms, is praiseworthy; but in Italy and Spain the severer methods are adopted, much to the disgust of the Protestants and certainly forming a stumbling-block to their conversion. Protestant sermons excel those of the Catholic clergy because they are devoted to the exposition and practical bearing of Holy Scripture and to the preaching of the Cross, and not to miserable fables and scraps of incomprehensible Latin and rhetoric, which make a pretence to wisdom. The Protestants do not use gesticulations like Peter Basil, who in 1648 took rockets and fireworks into the pulpit to illustrate the story of the rich man. Such men make the congregations laugh, and are better styled as jesters and buffoons than as preachers of the gospel. Latin was introduced into the Church Service for a very good reason in time past, but the vernacular must be introduced so that the people can follow the service along with the clergy.

Thirdly, the Landgrave records certain abuses in worship and ceremony which, though they do not belong to the essence of Catholicism, have had a corroding influence on its life. Among them he places the abuse of Invocation of the Saints, of images, of relics, of private Masses, of Indulgences, of the multiplication of Saints' Days, etc. He defends the Roman custom of Communion in one kind, but expresses himself strongly on the theatrical setting in which the service is conducted. He condemns the practice of folk-dancing in Spain as an adjunct to the service, because it destroys the central idea of Communion; and recalls with dismay the sight of 200,000 communicants at Treves, who rushed to their Communion without preparation or Confession. In Paris, he says, Communion is rushed at Easter, when 50,000 people communicate without due preparation.

The most interesting part of the book deals with the methods of compulsion in the Roman Church. Inquisitions, threats, the summoning of the secular arm are all necessary for the preservation of the Faith against false teachers; but these means must be used with Christian love and with wise foresight. The New Testament is entirely on the side of Augustine's maxim "religio suadetur, non cogitur, verbo, nunquam ferro." Persecution makes martyrs and destroys the influence of the Church. Cardinal Pallavicini relies on the assertion that Spain and Italy were saved by the shedding of a few drops of blood. But have not the Thirty Years' War, the French League, the S. Bartholomew Massacre in Paris, the Inquisitions of Philip II and of Alba, the Savoy War, and the foolish religious persecutions in Hungary weakened in every way the Catholic Powers by giving rise to Protestant Republics and by strengthening the enemies of Christendom to the disadvantage of the Roman Church?

Indirect and lesser methods of compulsion are to be deplored. The Landgrave "has often seen with horror in Italy and France how that hatred against the Protestants has deprived criminals on their way to the scaffold of the help of their ministers; the corpses of Protestants have been refused an honourable burial; their sick have been cast out of the hospitals, and their school children have been shut away." [1] A man who wants to snare a bird should not throw stones at it.

[1] Rommel, I. 148.

The intolerance of the Protestants is no excuse for breaking the Christian Law of Love. And in these days, the Landgrave justly asserts, a great change has come over heretics. The old brutal forms have given way to a milder form of heresy; modern heretics come under the charge of material and not formal heresy; they err in ignorance (ex ignorantia invincibili) and not in obstinate rebellion. It would be madness to fight them with the old weapons; they must be allowed to confound themselves, and the gentler method of teaching must be employed, while the civil union with them need not be broken. The Landgrave lived up to his teaching after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (Oct. 1685), when he entertained Huguenots at Rheinfels.

This book was the origin of the interesting correspondence between Leibnitz and the Landgrave. It was the sacrament of two generous souls; in it they met in fellowship and communion; one seeking to purge his Church for the day of Reunion, the other desirous of making great concessions if only Protestantism might receive a just consideration. The *Discreet Catholic* had been presented by the author to the late Duke;[1] Mons. Ditford was advised by the Landgrave that he would be able to obtain the loan of this copy by application to Leibnitz; it was, however, nowhere to be found. The first letter of the correspondence, dated 21 April, 1680, was to inform the Landgrave of this fact. The attitude which Leibnitz adopted to the *Discreet Catholic* opened the possibility of a correspondence fruitful of good for the cause of the Churches; and the Landgrave by his attitude encouraged Leibnitz to continue the correspondence, until it was broken off by the latter in May 1693. The course of this correspondence reveals some interesting facts on the question of Reunion in the Churches and of the attitude of Leibnitz in particular.

The correspondence reveals the extraordinary religious rapprochement which had taken place among the best minds of the Churches since the bitter experiences of the Thirty Years' War. The letters of the Landgrave illustrate in a more intimate and personal manner what the *Discreet Catholic* had already revealed—the passing of Catholic bitterness. He confesses that he makes " open profession of great

[1] John Frederick.

toleration towards the Protestants," [1] but the fanatics made his life difficult. Certain Catholics condemned him for his moderation; and, as he writes to Leibnitz 30/20 Nov. 1680, "for the following articles": [2] (1) for not desiring to allow infallibility to the Pope in decrees of dogma outside the General Council; (2) for taking the side of those who held the Pope subject to the Council "ob mores" as well as "ob fidem"; (3) for not believing that the secular and spiritual power can be united in the same person; (4) for allowing the equality of the two first Apostles; and, among other things, for holding that the Roman Church needs reform not only in ecclesiastical discipline but even in worship, and above all in its instruction of the ordinary and simple folk; and that every step possible must be taken for the Reunion of the Eastern and Protestant Churches with Rome. "But I know and believe with all my heart," he concludes, "that I have had at least a good and right intention, for no other end than the glory of God and for the welfare of my neighbour, according to the few talents which God has been pleased to allot to me; and I have this satisfaction that various people of great piety and learning and of both sides have indeed shared my ideas." [3]

The Landgrave's idea of authority is extremely moderate. "If Protestants would just fix sincere reliance," he says in a letter of 21/31 May, 1683, "on what can be proved from the witness of the third, fourth and fifth centuries . . . in which all the Oriental Churches agree almost entirely with Rome, this lamentable schism would soon be removed." [4] He takes three tests for religious truth: Holy Scripture, the tradition of the first five centuries, and right reason.

Leibnitz, at least in the early years of the correspondence, was closely in sympathy with the main lines laid down by the Landgrave. As he expressed himself on the doctrine of Justification: "the ideas of some Catholics appear to me more reasonable than those of some Protestants." [5] The quotations above in reference to the *Systema* [6] are sufficient indication of this; but there are others of importance. On the question of authority in the Church, Leibnitz repeats almost the same thoughts as his correspondent. "The

[1] Rommel, II. 449.
[2] *Ibid.*, I. 270.
[3] Letter dated 30/20 Nov. 1680.
[4] Rommel, I. 330. 21/31 May, 1683.
[5] *Ibid.*, 277, 1680.
[6] P. 108.

authority of the ancient Church," he writes, "is without doubt of great weight in matters which Holy Scripture has not defined in express terms." [1] Or again, "We may say that the religious parties have three principles: (1) the authority of tradition, (2) Scripture, (3) philosophy. Authority is the principal guide of the Romans and the Greeks, Scripture of the Protestants, and philosophy of the Socinians. All three principles are good, but are capable of abuse." [2]

The classic passage, however, for this strange rapprochement after the Thirty Years' War is found in a letter addressed by the Landgrave to a Catholic prince. Leibnitz is described as a Lutheran by birth and training, although his friendship with Baron Boineburg at Mainz had influenced his religious proclivities. His attitude was essentially intermediary. "I believe," writes Ernest, "that though he is not satisfied with everything in his party, nevertheless he cannot agree with everything in ours; and that he is persuaded that there is still, on both sides, much that is human." "He does not seem, to me at least, to be really persuaded nor convinced of the need of actually becoming a Roman Catholic—in the sense of joining the visible Body." However, he absents himself from Communion perhaps for two reasons: "on the one hand, in order not to communicate as a Catholic, because of the lack of the chalice . . . and, on the other hand, because of the lack of a lawful vocation in the Protestant minister, and on account of certain errors which he thinks they hold, and perhaps even because he thinks them schismatics." "He is far removed from the opinion of other Protestants who believe that the Pope is the real and divinely revealed Antichrist of Scripture. . . . His one complaint against the Roman Church is that it demands a blind reference in everything to the Council of Trent, which, however, in his opinion, has made certain definitions which trouble him." "He is otherwise a very honest man . . . a great wit, very approachable in discussion, tolerant and virtuous, and indeed devout . . . 'Utinam dum talis, noster esset.'" [3]

The same insight into the religion of the best minds of Hanover is given in letters referring to the Court. The

[1] Rommel, I. 379, 4/14 Aug., 1683. [2] *Ibid.*, II. 395, 20/30 Jan., 1692.
[3] *Ibid.*, II. 105 ff.

funeral of John Frederick, "the Light of the Catholic Religion," [1] was marked by a very splendid ceremony; "it must have seemed very strange, not to say bizarre, that the obsequies were rendered partly in the Protestant use and partly in the Catholic." [2] The Catholic prince of a Protestant people was buried amidst the tolerant spirit which he himself had helped to generate. His successor Ernest Augustus was a Protestant; but he inherited his brother's spirit of tolerance. Leibnitz wrote, 26/16 Nov., 1690: "The Duke, who has many Catholics at Court as well as elsewhere, has thought well that it is unreasonable to prevent anyone from following his religious belief, and that it is better to have good Catholics than people without any religion." [3] The Landgrave replies, 19/9 Dec. of the same year, in terms of congratulation: "No praise can be sufficient for your Master in his wise conduct in religious matters at Hanover; would to God that all the Protestant princes would only imitate him and that the Catholics on their side would do the same." [4]

References of this kind, added to the information which the early religious treatises of Leibnitz, Molanus and the theologians at Hanover yield us, make it clear that there has not been a moment before or since in the history of the Church when Rome and Protestantism were so near to each other. One of the most interesting facts of the whole period is that Spinola came to a Catholic prince at Hanover in order to carry out Peace negotiations; those negotiations fell through, largely because of the death of the prince; but they were taken up soon after in an even more enthusiastic spirit by a prince who was by conviction a Protestant.

Another important fact about the correspondence with the Landgrave is that it was contemporaneous with the Reunion Movement itself at the Court of Hanover. This can be said of no other correspondence extant; so that the continuous, intimate and personal nature of the letters of the Landgrave and of Leibnitz are a revelation of the inner story of Reunion.

A searchlight is thrown on the person and work of Spinola. The opinions of Guhrauer, who was unfortunate in publishing his Biography one year before Rommel edited the correspondence, fall completely before a passage like this:

[1] Rommel, I. 246. "La lumière de la religion catholique."
[2] *Ibid.*, 247. [3] *Ibid.*, II. 248. [4] *Ibid.*, 254.

"Concerning the Bishop of Tina I have spoken to him several times, and I may tell Your Highness, in reference to the doubts which you have expressed, (1) that he is a Spaniard and not an Italian; (2) that he speaks good German, having been in Germany for more than twenty years; (3) that he has taught theology among the Franciscans" (lit. "in his order"), "and is therefore not ignorant of positive and scholastic theology. (4) I consider, moreover, that he is not badly equipped for controversy, at least, as far as is necessary for his purpose, (5) which is not based only on the popular articles of Communion in two kinds, on the marriage of priests and on similar articles, which it seems have been reported to Your Highness, but he goes deeper and touches a little more on the essentials. (6) He has given me positive assurance that he possesses the approval of several Catholic theologians to whom he had stated the contents of his plan and who had accepted it after much criticism and discussion. (7) I have not seen the pamphlets which he has exchanged with several Protestant theologians, but what he told me of his purpose seemed possible. (8) However, although I consider the matter possible and in harmony with the principles of the two parties, I confess that in view of the present state of the world I do not think it probable that he will have success without the supposition that there is more equity and reason in people generally and in theologians particularly than we may be led to expect. He himself does not expect to see a sudden and complete success except that the result will be to keep the path continually prepared that posterity might profit by it. As he spoke to me of his plan on condition that it should not be made public I must keep my promise; but I have urged him to look Your Highness up when he leaves here, which he has shown himself very anxious to do, should his route allow him." [1] Such a passage verifies the argument of Chapter III, that Leibnitz was personally interested in the work of Spinola and was filled with enthusiasm over the proposals which he brought.

In answer to this letter the Landgrave thanked Leibnitz for his summary of the Spinola negotiations (21/31 May, 1683), and expressed his opinion that the "Protestant Party rather than the Catholic might gain some advantage

[1] In answer to a letter of the Landgrave, not extant, 27 April, 1683.

from them"; he repeats a popular rumour of the day, which incensed the Catholic world of that time, "I have seen," he says, "with my own eyes letters belonging to your party in the possession of Mons. Spener at Frankfort, from which certain people boast that the said Bishop has already greatly relaxed what the Council of Trent decreed and defined on the question of Justification"; "nevertheless I neither want to believe, nor to hope for, that; since it would be more likely to recommend him for a dungeon in the Inquisition than for a good Bishop and for the Purple"; [1] he would very much like to see him at Frankfort on the whole question. We are not told whether Spinola and the Landgrave met; we are, at any rate, made cognisant of the fact that German Catholics were, generally speaking, shocked at such documents as the "Regulæ."

Leibnitz breaks out again on this subject with a great Catholic concession, which he openly confessed in the *Systema* of the same year (1684). In March of that year he wrote to the Landgrave informing him that he had answered a letter from Mons. Alberti, Professsor of Theology at Leipzig, on the question of the Spinola negotiations in the following terms: "I have stated in express terms that I believe that if we can remedy the evils and abuses which afflict the Church by recognising the primacy of the Pope, we should be wrong in not doing so." [2] This is another clear personal testimony to the "Catholicism" of Leibnitz.

When the Landgrave threw doubt on the whole Spinola efforts for Reunion because they were out of keeping with what he anticipated Rome would concede, Leibnitz wrote some important letters to make him reconsider his decision. On Dec. 29, 1684, he writes: "The Bishop of Tina has been favourably received at Rome, and I believe that he has returned to Germany in order to continue his work. I confess that it will be no small matter if the Pope approved of his plan and would receive those Protestants, who would return to the Roman Communion and submit to a future Council without binding them to recognise the Council of Trent." [3] On August 22, 1688, Leibnitz advances one step further: "The Pope," he says, "has approved to the utmost of the plans of the Bishop of Neustadt; I have seen the original letters of the General of the Jesuits and of other

[1] Rommel, I. 339, 340. [2] *Ibid.*, II. 25. [3] *Ibid.*, 59.

theologians at Rome." [1] In the same year he grew more emphatic. "I have had the privilege," he writes, "of seeing the Bishop at Neustadt itself, where he treated me with great courtesy. He showed me some authentic documents which prove that the Pope, some Cardinals, the General of the Jesuits, the Master of the Sacred Palace, and others . . . have given their approval." [2] He continues to show his appreciation of the work of Spinola by a touch of humour. "The greatest sign," he says, "that the Bishop of Neustadt can give of the sincerity of his praiseworthy intentions is that now that he has a splendid bishopric, where he can live as the most satisfied man in the world, nevertheless he has the same zeal and is ready to take up the thread of his work again as soon as he sees some appearance of results." [3] On Oct 9, 1691, Leibnitz drove the Landgrave to desperation by sending him a copy of the imperial letter under which Spinola performed his negotiations. "I take the liberty," he says with some hesitation, "of sending to Your Highness a printed copy of the permit which the Emperor gave to Mons. of Neustadt, begging you very humbly to have it sent back to me because it is not my own." [4] Leibnitz, however, remained convinced of the value of Spinola's work. In spite of the difficulties of Reunion, he maintains that "Communion could yet be established following the plans of the Bishop of Neustadt . . . but I believe that we shall not yet see them put into practice because of the passions which rule on both sides." [5] "Posterity will be able to reap the benefit" (2/12 Sept., 1691). He was of the opinion that Spinola was right in theory, and wrote a letter on the 9th of October, 1691, on this very point. "With regard to the work of the Bishop of Neustadt, it is not a question as to whether the matter is practicable in these times nor even if it would be practicable at a later date . . . but if it is not feasible and permissible in itself . . . with a possibility based on right, without considering the hopes of our present times and circumstances." "I ask Your Highness with all humility to examine the matter with your usual penetration into the theory of it, by asking if, supposing the wills of men were well disposed, it would not be praiseworthy and perhaps even obligatory." "It would always be of con-

[1] Rommel, II. 178. [2] *Ibid.*, 196. [3] *Ibid.*, 197.
[4] *Ibid.*, 331. [5] *Ibid.*, 317.

siderable value to establish this fact in itself reserving to posterity the task of profiting by it some day." [1] The whole tone of Leibnitz's correspondence with the Landgrave is one of praise and enthusiasm for the plans of Spinola, and the verdicts of Guhrauer [*Biog.* I. 342 ff.], who had only seen the correspondence covering the three years 1683–85, and of Russell [p. xc.], who ought to have seen Rommel but shows no evidence of having done so, must be completely set aside. One final sentence expresses the deepest note sounded by Leibnitz; reviewing the history of religion during the century, he says: "I approve of the work of the Bishop of Neustadt in itself without any reference to ideas of temporal interest, for I believe that it is the only means of abolishing the schism without war and the shedding of blood." [2]

The final expressions of the Landgrave are extremely bitter, and may be taken as the general view of the Catholic world at that date, 18/8, Jan. 1692. "There is nothing in the world so wrong, iniquitous and absurd as to imply and believe that the Protestants are not schismatics, as though the terms made by a few Lutherans with Bishop Roxas, then Bishop of Tina and now of Neustadt, were in any way whatever reasonable and feasible; a fact so pointless that it ought to make one ashamed; as if certain opinions and aims of a German prince should rule Catholics of Europe and of the whole world, and as if our bishops in Germany, France, Italy, Spain and Poland would desire to sit in Council with the Bishops, Superintendents and Overseers who are so unchaste and sometimes married three or more times and who really, according to our principles, are usurpers of the Ministry of the Church. And when neither Spain nor Italy, nor practically any nation on our side, wants the use of the chalice, ought we to desire such a partial, not to say, shameful union? What are you doing, my good Leibnitz, to think that in this matter I am of your wish and sentiment?" [3]

[1] Rommel, II. 329. [2] *Ibid.*, 393.

[3] *Ibid.*, 381. This correspondence is also a splendid source of introduction to other personalities in the Reunion Movement, both within and without Germany. On STENO, the Papal Vicar at Hanover, see I. 250, 257, 274; II. 41, etc.; PELISSON, II. 241, 245, 261, 286, 340, 355, 386, 396, 455; SPENER, I. 260, 277, 339; II. 6, 16, 25, 27, 30, 64, 133, 134 ff., 316, 418, 459; BOSSUET, I. 313, 332, 380; II. 23, 40, 53, 341, 348, 360, 455, 464; THE POPES, I. 265, 364; II. 204, 207, 216, 217, 290, 291. ARNAULD is mentioned on numerous occasions. GALLICANISM, JANSENISM and other contemporary

Here we reach the most fascinating aspect of the whole correspondence. Ernest and Leibnitz clarified their personal views on Reunion under the inevitable compulsion which all communication of opinion is bound to bring. The process went on unconsciously, and no doubt its results were a sorrow and a surprise to both correspondents; it was a valuable contribution to Irenics, because it illustrated the fact that clear principles are more important than good intentions in the work for Reunion.

The sincerity and affection of the writers is obvious from the beginning of the correspondence. The spirit of the following passage from a letter of the Landgrave dated 30/20 Nov. 1680 would be lost by translation: "Vous avez très chrestiennement et très prudemment dit que, comme d'un costé les Protestans sônt obligés à la recherche du retour et de la Réunion, qu'aussi de l'autre costé les Catholiques leur en doivent faciliter et applanir et raccourcir le chemin. Mais helas! 'quia totus mundus in maligno positus' et que le monde ne s'applique guères à ce qu'est de l'esprit de Dieu, c'est pourquoi que de pas un des costés on y songe et qu'on ne s'y applique guères comme on devroit. Et entre autres la pluspart de nos Princes d'Allemagne parleront et s'amuseront plustost des discours de chasse, de chevaux et de toutes sortes de divertissement, que de la contrition de Joseph, et de la destruction du Sanctuaire, et même nos Princes Catholiques Ecclesiastiques sont tant occupés avec ce que nostre Seigneur au moins n'a point voulu qu'on recherchast le premier, (de sorte) que l'affaire de la Réunion en matière de Religion demeure à la remise de celuy, qui à St Paul disoit, que pour une autre fois il l'entendroit. Oh, mon cher Monsieur, asseurez vous d'une chose; si tant Catholiques que Protestans vouloient seulement tout de bon les uns envers les autres proceder, comme ils devroient, et avec l'aide de Dieu aussi pourroient faire . . . et tenir separé ce qu'en doit estre, a sçavoir l'esprit de Christ avec celuy du monde, et en une charité non feinte, que bientost Dieu leur feroit la grace de trouver le veritable chemin de la Réunion" (Rommel, I. 258, 259). These are the words of a Prince,

movements in the Church are well treated, II. 103, 118, 131, 153 ff., 225, 226, 313, 336, 349, 377, 390. The strangest omission is that on Molanus. Was he *persona ingrata* with the Landgrave? The best source for information on this interesting man is Foucher, I. and II. (see Index to Tome II.).

who was possessed of a pure and disinterested spirit in the service of the Church; the whole passage is like a call from the best period of the Middle Ages. Leibnitz shares the same spirit in an undated letter of 1680, which no doubt was the reply to the above-quoted letter of the Landgrave. "J'apprehende fort," he cries, "que la pluspart des personnes ne soient que très peu persuadées de la verité de leur religion; autrement ils agiroient d'un autre air, et ils ne traiteroient pas si cavalierement les affaires du salut." [1]

Expressions of deep affection occur on almost every page of the earlier years of the correspondence. Again, translation would rob them of their warmth. "O! que je m'estimeroys bien heureux, et comme moitié au Paradis terrestre de pouvoir jouir de vostre conversation; escrivez moy, je vous prie, si nous ne nous sommes veu quelque part" [2] (21/31 May, 1683). Could a prince say more to the Librarian and Aulic Counsellor of Hanover? In Nov. 1684 he went further. "I pray you," he wrote, "with all my soul that you would keep to your plan of visiting these parts and of paying me the honour of visiting me here; which I shall consider a particular favour." [3] Leibnitz showed the same affection for the Landgrave; the letter on his return from Rheinfels will suffice to illustrate his attitude. "Il est de mon devoir," he writes 10/9 Dec. 1687, from Frankfort, "de remercier V.A.S. avec toute la dévotion en toute la soumission que je lui dois des graces, que j'ay reçues de sa part pendant mon sejour à Rheinfels, aussi bien qu'auparavant, et je ne souhaite rien d'avantage, que de pouvoir témoigner combien je suis sensible à toutes ses bontés." [4]

To this obvious sincerity and affection was added a conviction that Reunion was a possibility. After reading an extract from the *Discreet Catholic* Leibnitz expressed his opinion that "if there was a sign that a pious and intelligent Pope would carry out the reform of Popular Worship, in which he would undoubtedly be supported by the secular clergy of France and even by the bishops and Catholic princes of Germany and by all those who are enlightened in Italy, I believe that the work of Reunion would be helped forward" [5] (1680). About the same time he wrote: "I am persuaded for my part that the differences (between

[1] Rommel, I. 277. [2] *Ibid.*, 341. [3] *Ibid.*, II. 55.
[4] *Ibid.*, 111. [5] *Ibid.*, I. 251.

Catholicism and Protestantism), when they are examined to their foundations, are for the most part composed of abuses." [1] The Landgrave was of the same opinion, as we have already seen above.

As the correspondence continued, however, it became clear that there was a fundamental difference of principles between them; they were agreed in their longing for Reunion, but, unconsciously at first and consciously later, they were divided on their methods of procedure. The letters of the Landgrave assumed more and more the nature of sermons and their aim little by little the conversion of Leibnitz; on the other hand, the letters of Leibnitz became more and more apologetic and their aim the formulation of protective principles.

A preliminary sign of divergence is evident as early as Nov. 1682. The Landgrave sent a theological work to Leibnitz with the following comment: "I am afraid that this work will not please you at all, as I should like, since you are still very far removed from its principles. and you will still make difficulties over the Article of Transubstantiation which has been received and believed throughout so many centuries in East and West and by so many men of deep piety and profound doctrine." "Verily on this score (at this rate) you are still far removed from the path of Catholicism." [2] The culmination of the Landgrave's growing attempts to convert his correspondent came in a letter of Nov. 1, 1683, with the dedication in Italian, "An Alarum for my very beloved and able Leibnitz"; it was an open and undisguised invitation into the Roman Communion. The letter opens with a word of praise: "My dear Leibnitz, you are indeed endowed with so many sound qualities—I say it without flattery or adulation—and with a power and experience that are unusual; you are, however, much more responsible . . . than anyone who does not possess these qualities for making your life harmonise with the knowledge that God has given you in the presence of so many thousands of people." "Is it possible . . . that you could still maintain your attitude

[1] Rommel, I. 291.

[2] *Ibid.*, 304 (25/15 Nov. 1682). Rommel has a note to the effect that the doctrine of Transubstantiation recorded in the "Systema" is plainly not Leibnitz's own conviction, but in the face of the extremely catholic tendency of other passages in this correspondence Leibnitz's views were not really known in 1682.

of actual separation from the Communion of the Roman Catholic Church . . . so that you want to remain a member of one of the sects of the Protestant Community, who for about a century and a half have actually been separated not only from the Roman Church but from the whole Church under pretext of having desired to reform the Church of its abuses?" The weaknesses of Protestantism are vividly described. The differences between the Churches are so great that the words of Elijah might be used as a challenge; Baal and Jehovah are at war again. The Lutheran Communion is invalid because of a defective Ministry. How could Leibnitz go to the Lutheran Communion? The Anabaptists and Socinians confess the same principles as the Protestants, but they have carried out these principles more faithfully than the Protestants; and if it is a question of practical morality "they are the most moral of all Christians to the extent of causing shame to the generality of Catholics." Leibnitz deplores certain aspects of Catholicism; the Landgrave also ventures to take sides with him in this matter, but, he adds, "they are not—Laus Deo—of such importance . . . that we should want to cast ourselves into the ranks of our open and chief enemies."

The letter closes with a long and subtle invitation into the Roman Church. Leibnitz must consider five thoughts, which the Landgrave holds before him out of sincere affection for him and with a view to his salvation and "ad gloriam Dei." Talents carry their great responsibility to the holder and must be used, not hidden; life is uncertain and we do not know when, how, or where we shall die; is not eternity more to us than this vain and perverse world?; nothing can compare with the truth and justice of God; and Leibnitz must remember that he stands on a different level before God from those people who cannot discern which direction they ought to take. After his appeal to these five considerations the Landgrave stoops to mundane motives. "Besides," he continues, "your worth and gifts are so great that several distinguished rulers and princes would, one after the other, solicit your services, and make you more comfortable than you are now"; [1] so that the Duke of Hanover would retain him, out of worldly wisdom, if he became a convert to Rome. And what an example he would set to others, as well as

[1] Rommel, II. 9.

finding rest for his soul through membership in the Church "which had been the Church of his country and nation since the early days of Christianity."

The Landgrave breaks into prayer that God "would bestow on Leibnitz what he himself could only wish—and that God would then perhaps by that little letter touch his heart." Urgency demands strong words. "I beg you," the Landgrave adds, "not to close the door to Him; for I am not speaking to a silly common ignoramus or to a coarse Lutheran, ill-acquainted with religious and general matters, but to a man of parts, replete with every sort of knowledge and experience." [1]

A marginal note makes a sentimental appeal. "What consolation and happiness will be in store for you when you make a good general confession before your death to a pious and learned Catholic priest and receive Absolution, instead of from a minister with all his fine phrases of consolation." [2]

The hope of Leibnitz's conversion inspired the Landgrave during the following years; the "Catholicism" of Leibnitz was in the ascendant. On 5/15 Feb. 1684 Ernest could write: "You are not very far from port"; on 20/10 Jan. 1685, "you are so very near . . . the point of coming over into the bosom of the Catholic Church." But on 7 June, 1688, he becomes impatient: "Oh, my dear Leibnitz," he writes, "'to-day if ye will hear His voice harden not your hearts' . . . all the Eastern Christians and the Protestants are schismatics. . . . Save yourself then, I implore you." [3]

Leibnitz tried the patience of his correspondent to the uttermost. The climax came in the publication of a satire, *Trifolium Lutheranum*, by the Landgrave (1692), in which Seckendorf, Ludolphi and Leibnitz were severely criticised. Leibnitz retaliated on 20/30 Jan. 1692. "I humbly beg Your Highness," he wrote in a postscript," not to allow your *Trifolium* to go further in those things which concern me; nor to accuse me of indifference, of which I in no way approve; I do not understand also on what ground you impute to me a sort of idolatry in respect of the interests of the House of Brunswick; those whom I serve I serve faithfully, but I have never had the meanness to approve of injustices in the way that I seem to be charged." [4] From this time the

[1] Rommel, II. 10. [2] *Ibid.*, 11. [3] *Ibid.*, 173. [4] *Ibid.*, 396.

letters of the Landgrave assume a coarseness which was entirely absent from his earlier correspondence. "You make me laugh about what you say on the Hussites. . . . On the one hand you are a man of really great knowledge and experience, but on the other hand I do not know whether you are so well read in matters of controversy . . . for then you could never with any semblance of truth say that Protestants had returned to antiquity." [1] There is little wonder that Leibnitz replied to this letter on 31/21 March, 1692, "Your Highness's last letter appeared to me to be very different from so many others that I have had the privilege to receive from you." [2]

It was evident that Leibnitz had broken with the Landgrave on matters of principle. In fact, he was retreating quickly from his earlier "Catholicism." It was not merely that he felt the obscurantism of Rome in questions of philosophy and of science; [3] he had moved one step further in his conception of the Church. It remains for us to consider what that step implied, at the same time bidding farewell to the Landgrave, who died the same year in which Leibnitz wrote the last letter of their correspondence (1693).

One correspondent narrowed down his view of the Church, while the other took a broader view as the correspondence progressed. The Landgrave struggled for a purified Roman system as his ideal; Leibnitz wanted a place for the Protestants. That led him directly to his conception of an "Inner Communion" of the Church, which at once included the "Outer Communion" and those who were sincerely desirous of Reunion when conditions gave them the opportunity. If he did not arrive at this conception from his knowledge of the history of the Great Schism as suggested above,[4] it came to him by his inherent love of justice, which he exhibits in all his legal works. And it was the "Alarum" letter of the Landgrave which drove him to protect his position by it. "I believe," he wrote in January 1684, "that a man may be in the Inner Communion of the Church Catholic without being a member of the 'Outer

[1] Rommel, II. 405. [2] *Ibid.*, 407. [3] *Ibid.*, 20, 21, and 35.

[4] See p. 40. His frequent references to the Councils of the Conciliar Period show that he was very interested in this movement in the Church. [N.B. Hermann von der Hardt published his *Magnum Œcum. Constantience Concilium* at Frankfort and Leipzig, 1696 ff. Leibnitz must have seen this wonderful edition of Conciliar writers.]

Communion,' as for example when a man is unjustly excommunicated by error or the malice of the judge." [1] He gives examples of people who desire to be members of the Visible Church, but cannot do so and retain their sincerity of aim. "For example, when the Jansenists were required to sign an offer 'de facto,' which they did not believe, it was not in their power to obey it even though they had been excluded from the Visible Communion of the Faithful." [2] In another example this new conception of the Church is linked up with the attack on the obscurantism of Rome. "If the Holy Fathers who thought that the rotundity of the earth was an absurdity . . . had demanded a recantation from the astronomers of their time, or if the Church of to-day had required of our astronomers the condemnation of the System of Copernicus," the same problem is taken into the realms of reason. "Opinion is not a matter which depends on the rule of the will and which one can change at pleasure." [3] Leibnitz then makes his personal confession. "In view of the fact," he says, "that I was born and reared outside the Roman Communion, I do not think it sincere nor trustworthy to offer myself for admission when I know that I shall perhaps not be accepted if I open my whole mind." [4]

At first this conception of the Inner Communion of the Church is held very cautiously and with the proviso that the Visible Church is infallible in all articles of Faith necessary to salvation; but it seems to have taken a deeper hold of Leibnitz as the years went on. Seven years later (on July 16, 1691) he wrote to Madame de Brinon in the following bold terms: "You are right, Madame, in thinking of me as a Catholic at heart; . . . for selfwill alone makes a heretic, and, Laus Deo, my conscience does not accuse me of that. The essence of Catholicity is not that of external Communion with Rome; otherwise those who are unjustly excommunicate would cease to be Catholics. . . . The essential and real Communion which constitutes our membership in the Body of Christ is love. All those who encourage the schism by their error of placing obstacles in the way of reconciliation, opposed to the dictates of love, are real schismatics, whereas they who are prepared to do all they can still to preserve the

[1] Rommel, II. 18. [2] *Ibid.*, 19. [3] *Ibid.*, 20. [4] *Ibid.*, 21.

Visible Communion are Catholics in reality." "These are principles on which we are obliged to have universal agreement." [1]

It is obvious that the thought of Leibnitz was undergoing a process of evolution under the impulse of self-communication involved in letter-writing. It was precisely at this point that he opened another, less personal but highly important correspondence with the Court historian of Louis XIV, Mons. Paul Pelisson. In so far as the correspondence was concerned with religion, its central purpose was to develop in detail the idea of the Inner Communion of the Church in reference to the great question of Reunion.

Paul Pellisson (Pelisson) Fontanier was born at Beziers on Oct. 30, 1624, of distinguished Calvinistic parents. He was a brilliant scholar, having studied the classics at Castres, philosophy at Montauban, law at Toulouse. For a period he practised at the Bar at Castres. At nineteen years of age his Latin translation of Justinian's *Institutes*, with a commentary, had established his reputation; but it was the letters of introduction from Valentin Conrart to the members of the Paris Academy which brought him into public notice. His *Histoire de l'Académie française* (1653) secured his place as a member of the Academy; his election having the unique distinction of taking place without a vacancy in the Academy. In 1657 he became secretary to the reckless Comptroller of the Finances, Fouquet, and though he joined to this office those of Master of the Accounts at Montelier (1659) and Counsellor to the King (1660), it was as secretary of Fouquet

[1] Foucher, I. 235, 236 (2nd edit.). It would be impossible to leave this correspondence without recording the fact that it is one of the richest sources extant for the period which it covers. Its value is not merely religious, though that was the supreme motive throughout. Nor is it limited to Germany, since other countries are frequently and intimately mentioned. Important references to England are made, I. 288, 314, 315, 326, 334; and II. 439, 440, etc.

A catalogue of the religious literature could be made from the books mentioned in the correspondence, cf. I. 272, 301, 327; II. 57, 63, 75, and numerous other places. (Erdmann truly wrote: "No great philosopher ever continued to be so eager for reading and so dependent upon it as did Leibnitz.") Incidental references are sometimes of the most valuable and intimate kind, *e.g.* I. 255 (30/20 Nov. 1680) Ernest writes from Venice: "En quinze jours au plus on a icy les lettres d'Hannover." I. 351: "L'invention des armes à feu et même celle de l'imprimerie ont changé la face de l'Europe, etc." II. 291: "Une chose dont je m'estonne est, que les Bombes ne sont pas encore assez employez dans les battailles navales, etc." See also I. 301; II. 147, etc., etc.

that he was lodged in the Bastille from 1661 to 1665. Here he wrote his *Mémoires* in defence of the Comptroller.

His life in prison was a time for thought. And his appointment on his liberation to the post of Court historian to Louis XIV (1666) gave him the great opportunity of carrying his thoughts into practice. His old Calvinism had proved insufficient for his spiritual needs; he became a convert to Rome (1670), took minor Orders and the subdiaconate, received the Abbey of Guieont and became administrator of diverse benefices and the disburser of funds for needy converts. His characteristic work was not to be found in pure history (like his fragmentary *Histoire de Louis XIV*), but in the more difficult realm of religious polemic against the Huguenots and the Protestants. Louis XIV had commissioned him to employ his knowledge of history in the interests of the Church, and to this end he wrote the book by which he will always be known, *Réflexions sur les différends en matière de religion* (1686), against Jurieu, a French Protestant writer who had settled in Holland, and Leibnitz himself. "The first part" of the work "was printed at Paris in two volumes in Dec. 1686. The following year the author had it reprinted with the addition of a new volume entitled *Reply to the Objections from England and Holland* on the Authority of the Majority in Christianity." Some time afterwards he added another volume, divided into four parts, and entitled *The Idle Fancies of Mr. Jurieu, etc.* The three first volumes were reprinted in Holland, Nov. 1689, while the fourth was published in Paris, 1692, under the title *On Tolerance in Religion: Letters of Mr. Leibnitz and the Replies of Mr. Pelisson.* These letters are vital to our subject, and have been edited from the autographs by Foucher with other important additions. A most personal reference is made to them in the correspondence with the Landgrave, 13/23 Nov. 1691. "I send herewith," Leibnitz writes, "to Your Highness what Mons. Pelisson has despatched to me from Paris, asking you to have it sent back again to me, because it is the only copy that we possess. . . . He was led of his own accord to have my objections and his replies printed; I have noted some passages for correction." [1] This is a very realistic reference to the preparatory measures for printing the letters on religion which passed between Leibnitz

[1] Rommel, II. 340.

and Pelisson. The idea of publication originated with Pelisson.

The origin of the correspondence is not far to seek. Louise Hollandine, sister of the Duchess Sophia of Hanover, and Abbess of Maubuisson,[1] was determined to use the *Réflexions* for the conversion of her sister and the Court of Hanover; she sent a copy through Madame de Brinon, her secretary, to Sophia, who, following her usual practice, committed the cause of answering it to Leibnitz. "Her Royal Highness the Duchess," wrote Leibnitz to the Landgrave on 3/13 Oct. 1690, "invited me to make some observations on the *Réflexions* of Mr. Pelisson." Some time in the earlier half of the following year he expressed his thanks to Mme. Brinon for her share in his introduction to Pelisson. "If I had no other obligation," he writes, "than that of having obtained the acquaintance of a man of such fame as Mons. Pelisson, I could not excuse myself from addressing myself to you personally, in order to thank you formally for it." [2]

The correspondence has its own peculiar properties. Unlike that with the Landgrave or that with Bossuet, it was very short in duration; it was also shadowed for nearly two years out of three by the illness of Pelisson; like the Landgrave, Pelisson was more than twenty years senior to Leibnitz, while Bossuet was barely twenty years his senior. The short duration of the correspondence explains the incompleteness of the ideas adumbrated. The illness of Pelisson makes it easy for us to understand why Leibnitz, overcome by personal grief, occasionally broke through the convention of using Mme. Brinon as an intermediary and addressed Pelisson himself personally; while it gives the reason for the less controversial nature of the later letters, which were occupied with pleasant subjects of philosophy or science rather than with the thorny questions of religious controversy. The correspondence opened about the middle of 1690 and closed with the death of Pelisson, Jan. 1693.

On one occasion only was there a sign of cleavage. Pelisson published the early letters as we have seen; Leibnitz complained,[3] but soon returned to his early praise and

[1] See below, p. 211 ff. [2] Foucher, I. 198. [3] *Ibid.*, xlix.

adulation of the Court historian. Unlike the other great correspondences there is no trace of bitterness. Indeed, there are passages of great and intimate friendliness. When Leibnitz realised that Pelisson was ill he proceeded at once to express himself in the warmest terms. Pelisson was the one man to set forward the Reunion Movement in the Churches. "If there is a man in the world," he wrote to Mme. Brinon on May 9, 1691, "who can help that movement far forward, it is Mons. Pelisson himself, whose learning is as incomparably great as his judgment, and, like the completely just expressions of his zeal, are universally admitted. That is why the information which you give me has caused me great anxiety, and I pray God with all my heart that He will restore such a great man to us." [1] Passages of this sort may be quoted without end from about June 1691, when Leibnitz, "his deference yielding to his zeal," [2] began a direct correspondence with Pelisson himself. On the other hand, Pelisson poured out his soul to Leibnitz. What could be more intimate than the account of his own conversion, which he sent to Leibnitz through Brinon? [3] "As for me," he writes from Versailles, April 23, 1691, "when I found myself, in time past, in a similar condition to his own, I opened my mind to the late Bishop of Tournai, a great prelate and my peculiar friend; . . . I remember how I spoke to him in these very words: 'I do not ask for reasons from you, but for your prayers. You, on your part, pray for three days and I will pray on mine, and, of your charity, help me to be either a Huguenot or a Catholic for life.' Action followed in the spirit of these words, and I placed my solemn renunciation into his hands. After that I was bound only by slender material threads—long habit, novelty in my future life, a thousand silly dislikes—after praying to God I felt too happy to be able to make my first sacrifice of them to Him. The tears still rise in my eyes, Madame, as I write this to you What would you and I not give to see a man so kind, upright and intelligent as he of whom we speak in the same condition?" [4]

These passages show that the dominant motive of the

[1] Foucher, I. 217. [2] *Ibid.*, 220.
[3] Pelisson even asked for an account of Leibnitz's life by himself. See Foucher, I. liv, on this matter.
[4] Foucher, I. 213.

correspondents was again the Reunion of the Churches. In his *Pensées sur la quatrième partie des Réflexions* [1] Leibnitz revealed his principal attraction towards Pelisson. "Catholics are to be praised," he writes, "who are of the opinion of M. Pelisson that the obstacles to reconciliation are gradually disappearing . . . and that Catholic truth is to be found in the Confession of Augsburg. . . . The Rev. Jesuit Father Jean Dez, of Strassburg, explains the doctrine which is common to the two sides, and that in some fundamental articles both sides teach positively the same thing; a matter which being clearly understood by keen Catholics will, little by little, lead to a better feeling. They will no longer persecute the Protestants of the Confession of Augsburg as heretics; dragonnade conversions will cease; Protestants in return will give up their aversion against the Pope when they see themselves kindly treated." [2] Many other passages may be quoted in illustration of the same truth.

Pelisson took up the attitude of a tolerant Gallican. Reunion could not be established on any other principle than that of the infallibility of the Church as the one unique bond of all the Faithful; but conversions were not to be made à la dragonnade, which was the horror of all good men; the way of explanation and argument was to be adopted. And to this way Leibnitz replied.

His reply was an extension of the argument which he had used with the Landgrave. The bounds of the Church must be widened. Foucher sums the reply up under three heads: "(1) The difference between the material and formal heretic; that it is possible to be a material heretic and yet be saved; (2) the unique rule of Faith according to Leibnitz is only to believe what is proved; (3) salvation depends above all things on love towards God and union with Him." But it is better to follow the order of Leibnitz himself, remembering at the same time that the unifying idea behind his whole argument is the necessity of recognising the "Inner Communion" of the Church. He seeks out the weaknesses in the ancient armour of his correspondent.

He attacks the *Réflexions* on its philosophic basis, although he cannot refrain from praising this excellent book, which "is of an entirely different kind (tendency) from the many books which have come from France for some time." As

[1] Foucher, I. 320 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, 323.

Pelisson insists, religion must have a reasonable basis, otherwise it would be an arbitrary and uncertain subject. He forgets, however, that there are two kinds of motives which lead us to a conclusion in matters of Faith: "some are explicable, others are inexplicable." "Those that I call explicable may be propounded to other people by a clear process of reasoning; but the inexplicable motives exist solely in our conscience or perception and within our inner experience, into which we could not cause others to enter without finding means of making them experience the same things in the same way." [1] It is not always possible to say what we find agreeable or disagreeable in a person, a picture, a sonnet or a ragoût. In the same way those who find within them a "ray which makes them perceive some (divine) truth" take their stand on "motiva credibilitatis," or inexplicable motives. Leibnitz admits the danger of illusion, but he establishes his fact that such interior motives must be considered, and that the boundaries of the Church must be widened to enclose them.

He goes further. He gives a list of Catholic theologians who support the amazing thesis, when "inexplicable motives" have taken the lead, that "there is no article of revelation which is absolutely necessary, and that a person may thus be saved in all religions, provided only he loves God truly above all things." [2] Love towards God is the fundamental article of the Christian Faith; the rest are secondary.

Persons outside the Visible Church of Rome must be considered in the light of these ideas. "All are not rebels who are outside the Communion of the Church. Theologians agree that a person may be unjustly excommunicated. Moreover, Catholics agree that there are 'material heretics' whom they dare not condemn; according to them it is disobedience alone which condemns. Now he who does not hear the orders, or does not understand them, or indeed cannot carry them out . . . is not disobedient. . . . Opinions are not subject to volition and we cannot rid ourselves of them when we will." [3] This conception of the "material heretic" was dear to Leibnitz, and he makes it the essence of his answer to Pelisson in his communication

[1] Foucher, I. 129, 130.
[2] Foucher, I. 133.
[3] *Ibid.*, 174.

to the Landgrave.[1] But it was dear to him chiefly because it pointed the way to the inclusion of the Protestants within the fold of the Church. The Protestants come under the scope of the "material heretics" who "seem to be outside the Church but are in reality part of it; or else who are outside the Visible Communion of the Church, but being in ignorance and insuperable error, are considered excusable; and if they have besides charity and contrition, they are virtually within the Church and 'in voto' and are saved as well as those who are visible members of the Church."[2] Leibnitz applies this conception with a conscious sense of its possibilities. "Let us apply this reservation to the Protestants," he says, "and we shall find that they are of this number."[3] He enters upon a long discussion for the purpose of proving his thesis, and concludes with a happy picture of Louis XIV calling the Church together in spite of the ills of Europe. "I do not entirely despair," he concludes, "of the alleviation of the ills of Europe, when I think that God can deliver us from them by changing the heart of one single person who seems to have the happiness or misery of people in his hands. . . . This is the place where the inimitable eloquence of Mons. Pelisson would be able to excel, by persuading the King that he is greater than he thinks. . . . What panegyric can we picture to ourselves more magnificent and glorious than that of one whose success would be followed by the Peace of Europe and even by the Unity of the Church?"[4]

Leibnitz sums up his opinions in an important paragraph on his conception of the Church. "I confess, then, that the Church, which is a kind of republic, has the advantages of other republics, and indeed in a supreme manner; it must have authority and executive power . . . and God takes upon Himself the burden of carrying out its sentences; but it is with some restrictions. We owe obedience to those above us and to the Church more than to all others; that is saying a good deal, but I say it nevertheless; the Church, however, is not authorised of God to lay claim to an absolute obedience."[5] There are genuine people who are free from the anarchy of the Anabaptists and from the indifference of the Socinians, who cannot conscientiously join the Church.

[1] Rommel, II. 241. [2] Foucher, I. 199. [3] *Ibid.*, 200.
[4] *Ibid.*, 208. [5] *Ibid.*, 175.

"Let us not, then, be so bold in our pronunciation of condemnation against our brethren; and let us be satisfied by saying that it is dangerous to be deprived of the ordinary means of salvation; that is sufficient to make them see the importance of the Church and puts us all under an obligation to make every effort imaginable for the restoration of Unity." [1]

The correspondence with Pelisson had developed some of the details of Leibnitz's conception of the "Inner Communion" of the Church. In that sense it is a continuation of the same subject, which had been treated in the correspondence with the Landgrave. But it is also a continuation in the sense that it completed the preparation of Leibnitz for the biggest epistolary battle of his life—with Jacques Benigne Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux. The combined correspondence may be described in the words of Rommel as "the preamble to the keen fight which Leibnitz had with Bossuet over the ways to the Reunion of the Churches, and which at last drove the artfully concealed contradictions to the surface." [2] This correspondence is the climax of the efforts of Leibnitz for the Reunion of Catholics and Protestants.

[1] Foucher, I. 181. [2] Rommel, I. 235.

CHAPTER VI

THE CORRESPONDENCE WITH BOSSUET, BISHOP OF MEAUX

"His (Bossuet's) active brain and pen were also engaged in the renewal of a most interesting attempt to bring about reunion between the German Lutherans and the Church of Rome—an attempt which indeed requires a history to itself in any way to do it justice, but which nevertheless we may glance at, not only with a view to its historic interest as a part of Bossuet's theological career, but also as showing how very far some of the greatest and largest-minded men of his day were prepared to go in the path of conciliation and smoothing away hindrances to the Reunion of Christendom."—LEAR, *Bossuet and his Contemporaries*, p. 536 f.

"Bossuet is more than a Bishop, he is a Council; but Leibnitz is perhaps even more than that, he is a whole world."—FOUCHER, I. lxxi.

THE correspondence between Bossuet and Leibnitz is the climax of the efforts to build a bridge over the chasm which separated the Council of Trent from the Confession of Augsburg. Every other attempt was preparatory to it, and, indeed, was insignificant in the presence of this struggle of theological giants. One and a half centuries of thought blaze forth from the MSS. of this correspondence. Every argument that Catholicism could produce has taken its place in the letters of Bossuet, and Protestantism answered with all the wisdom and learning at its disposal in the letters of Leibnitz. It would not be an exaggeration to say that there is no other religious correspondence extant which so completely summarises the religious history of an epoch as that of the Bishop of Meaux and the Counsellor of the Court of Hanover. The dominant notes of that period, with its painful experience of schism and its longing for reunion and peace as well as its conscious struggle of opposite principles of religious belief, are echoed in almost every letter—"A new spectacle . . . of a philosopher and a bishop . . . working together for spiritual peace, for the unity of the faith—in a word, for the Reunion of the Churches," [1] in a century of deeply conflicting opinions.

[1] Foucher, I. lxv.

Bossuet differed in numerous ways from the other religious correspondents of Leibnitz. Unlike both the Landgrave and Pelisson, he had not experienced Protestantism from the inside; he was a Catholic by birth, education and training and not by conversion. Born at Dijon, 27 Sept. 1627, of a family of prosperous Burgundian lawyers, he was handed over to the Jesuits at the Collège des Godrans in the city. He took the tonsure at eight years of age, and at thirteen held a canonicate in the Cathedral of Metz, where his father had a seat in the Parliament or Provincial High Court. In 1642 he proceeded to the Collège de Navarre to complete his studies in philosophy and theology. His powers of oratory were prodigious. It is said that the Lent sermons of 1666 and the Advent sermons of 1668 won for him the Bishopric of Condam (consec. 1670). He seems to have preferred, however, his office as Preceptor to the Dauphin to his non-residential episcopate, which he rarely, if ever, saw. The important period of his life from the point of view of the Reunion of the Churches did not commence until 1681, when he was raised to the important See of Meaux. He gave himself up to the dream of his life, convinced as he was that spiritually and politically the supreme need of Europe was that of a reunited Church. In spite of the uncompromising nature of some of his letters and of the obvious cruelty of his policy against the Huguenots in France, it is impossible to refrain from a feeling of admiration for Bossuet; when in failing health, and from 1700 confined to his bed, he spent his last efforts in the work of Reunion; his latest letters to Leibnitz were indeed dictated to his secretary from his bed.

In addition to this exclusive training within the Church of Rome, it is essential to remember that Bossuet entered the correspondence with Leibnitz as a Bishop of great repute, with a record for the conversion of Protestants unequalled by any theologian before or since; Leibnitz was a layman, who had no such ecclesiastical prestige to carry him forward. Hundreds of Huguenots had succumbed before the arguments of the *Exposition* (1671) and the *Variations* (1688), or before the sword which was unsheathed against them at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes (Oct. 1685). Mme. de Brinon gave expression to a feeling, which Bossuet was wise enough to conceal for a later period of his correspond-

ence, when she wrote to the Bishop (5 April, 1692). "I told him (Leibnitz) that . . . he must imitate the prodigal son and say just these words: 'I have sinned and am not worthy to be called Thy Son,' which would be enough to move Our Mother to slay the fatted calf on behalf of the Protestants, that is to say, to grant them in love all that would not clash with the essentials of religion." [1] At the outset it must have seemed a daring venture for any scholar, however great, to match himself with Bossuet the "Exterminator of Heretics" and the trusted adviser of "le grand Monarque"! But Leibnitz was a great scholar and a clever controversialist, when controversy was required.

Pichler has emphasised the national standpoint of Bossuet as well as his religious point of view. "In order to describe the character of Bossuet it is sufficient to remember that one and the same Bossuet was the author of the *Exposition de la foi catholique*, of the *Histoire des Variations*, and of the *Defensio declarationis cleri gallicani*. The first small work was the forerunner of the Dragonnades, the second was the Apology for its efficacy and especially of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the last served as a justification for the French Policy against the Roman Curia." [2] This national standpoint is a matter of concern in relation to the correspondence with Leibnitz. Bossuet is a Frenchman in his outlook; he takes account of no other nation, and least of all of Germany. "Bossuet's Christianity, as it was illustrated in the correspondence with Leibnitz, is the foil of the politics of Louis XIV, no worse and no better, and in its results as fortunate and unfortunate." [3] Bossuet would not use his influence with the King for the better treatment of the Huguenots, because he believed that the policy of extermination was of national value; nor would he push the plans for Reunion at Court where German proposals were distasteful.

Foucher has drawn a delightful parallel between the writers which might aptly summarise the introduction to the correspondence. "Bossuet is more than a Bishop, he is a Council; but Leibnitz is perhaps still more, he is an entire world. If the Bishop of Meaux has behind him the Fathers of the Latin Church and of the Churches of Rome and Africa, who seem to him to have been slandered,

[1] Foucher, I. 341. [2] Pichler, II. 445. [3] *Ibid.*, 446.

Leibnitz, on his side, has the Greeks and all Protestant knowledge, represented by such men as Chemnitz, Gerhardt, Calixtus, Rainold, as well as the universities and the correspondence of the Protestants and Catholics of both Germany and other countries; and, among them, three historians of the first rank—Seckendorf, Rudolfi and Bauval. To the quotations of Bossuet he answers with scholastic theology of which Bossuet has little knowledge . . . he has read, studied and added notes on Greek and Latin antiquities, the history of Popes and of Councils, and the Scholastics which are least known as well as the most celebrated controversialists. . . . He has finally at his disposal and under his care the celebrated library at Wolfenbüttel of which he was Warden, and that rich collection specially collected by Prince Rudolph Augustus for illustrating the History of the Reformation. It must be confessed that this privilege was most valuable. Paris could offer nothing like it to the Bishop of Meaux. Leibnitz wrote his letters on the Canon of the Bible in the presence of the copy which had belonged to Luther and from which he had made his translation. . . . Never did a contest of secular learning equal this memorable debate between these two men, either in the importance of its questions or in the weight of its results." [1]

Until the publication of Foucher's volumes of the religious works of Leibnitz,[2] the origin of this correspondence was hidden in mystery, or rather the opinion of Guhrauer was accepted without further question—that it originated with the Spinola negotiations and was encouraged by the Princesses of the Court of Hanover. But its origin was purely literary. Bossuet's reply to a letter of Leibnitz is the first extant portion of the correspondence; it is dated from Versailles, 27 Nov. 1678, and contains a repeated request for the Latin version of parts of the Mishna. "There are three treatises of the Mishna," he writes, "which are called Babah or 'door,' 'entrance'; one is called Babah or Bathia, another Babah-Khama, the last Babah-Metzia, and they contain almost all the civil law of the Judæan Commonwealth, and it was of these in particular that I asked for the Latin Version and if it is extant." [3] Since

[1] Foucher, I. lxxi. ff.
[2] The collection of Dutens begins 10 Sept. 1691 (Dutens, I. 510 ff.).
[3] Foucher, I. 59.

Leibnitz quitted Paris for Hanover in Oct. 1678, this must be part of the earliest correspondence between the Bishop and the Librarian, whose new post offered him such splendid literary opportunities. Would it be hazardous to infer from the date and tone of this letter that Leibnitz had come into personal touch with Bossuet during his sojourn in Paris, and that the long correspondence which followed was the continuation of a friendship, originating like many other friendships of Leibnitz in a mutual love of learning?

The same tone is found in the reply of Leibnitz. "I learn," he replies, "that you have the good intention of translating the greater part of the Talmud, and I think that Mons. de Compiègne, whom I had the privilege of knowing in Paris, would be among those whom you might use for this end." [1] It looks as though Mons. Compiègne was a common friend of both Leibnitz and Bossuet. The details of the books follow, and the first hint of the religious turn of this correspondence points the way to the most interesting and most important letters of the later period. "Everyone thinks highly of your book of controversies," continues Leibnitz; "and the Bishop of Tina, who was here on the part of the Emperor and who thinks with you that gentler means must be used, was delighted with it, having received a copy of it from His Royal Highness my Master. Those of the opposite side are no less bound to recognise both the soundness of your thoughts and the candour of your dealings." [2] Bossuet is delighted with these words and sends three copies of the *Exposition* on the 1st of May, 1679, for the Duke, the Bishop and for Leibnitz himself.

The religious nature of the correspondence assumes supremacy from the date of the Spinola negotiations. Leibnitz wrote to Bossuet to inform him of the importance of the Reunion negotiations at the Court of Hanover. The reply shows the interest of the Bishop in this matter. "I am informed," he writes on 22 August 1683, from Fontainebleau, "that the negotiations of which you told me have had great results, and I have seen from the extract of a letter of the Duchess of Hanover to Mons. de Gourville that Articles of Reconciliation have been signed, the first of which is that the Pope shall be recognised as the Head of the

[1] Foucher, I. 61. [2] *Ibid.*, 62.

Church. . . . The interest that I take in the welfare of religion and also in your own honour, since you have privileged me with so much kindness, compels me to ask you to be so good as to explain to me in detail a matter of such importance." [1] He has communicated the news of Spinola's work to Louis XIV, and he concludes his letter with a special message to Leibnitz : " The King commended your pious plans and would value them in so far as he is made aware of them." [2]

There is no letter extant from 22 August 1683 to 5 Sept. 1691; at that time the correspondence has assumed a new vigour, and is carried on through the agency of the ladies in the Abbey of Maubuisson. It is important to consider their relation to the most important part of the correspondence; for at no period was the passion for Reunion so clearly expressed in both writers, and at no other time were they so completely united in one aim, unhindered by the unfortunate divergences of later years.

The brilliant family of the Elector Palatine Frederick V and of Elizabeth Stuart of England was unique. It was " composed of princes and princesses, Protestant or Catholic, pious or free-thinking, all of them conspicuous by their mental endowments; a family opposed by all the varied tendencies of the century, partly conquered by the Roman Church, partly rebels towards it and yet united." [3] The female side is the more intellectual and important; above all, the sisters Louise-Hollandine and Sophia, the mother of George I of England.

By the marriage of Princess Anne-Gonzague of Mantua, daughter of Charles Duke of Nevers, with Edward Count Palatine and brother of the famous sisters, a wholesale process of conversions to the Roman Church began within the family. Anne won her husband; this " was followed by that of the Princess Louise, whose virtues cause the fame of the sacred Abbey of Maubuisson to shine throughout the Church." [4] Louise forsook her old methods of life and managed to secure, at last, the Abbey of Maubuisson near Paris. Here she passed her days in a fairly comfortable round of prayer, painting and reading. It is unnecessary

[1] Foucher, I. 95. [2] *Ibid.*, 96. [3] *Ibid.*, xlvi.
[4] From the Funeral Oration of Bossuet, 1684, Foucher, I. xlvii.

to accuse her of anything more than the ordinary laxity of monastic establishments of that time.[1] Three pictures of her are described by Foucher; the last is of interest because it describes the Abbess in her life at Maubuisson. "She wears . . . the white veil, the woollen garment and 'the wooden Cross hanging from a long blue riband.' If we do not recognise in this picture the radiant girl whose somewhat romantic flight had been the object of so much comment, yet we see old age, without wrinkle or bitterness, in a woman who was a friend of the arts, and who had made Maubuisson, her wealthy abbey, a place of almost mundane pleasures, where piety was not too austere and asceticism did not overreach the walls of the cloister." "Afflicted by illness and walking no more without the aid of a friend Louise-Hollandine is pictured at her window, from which she watches the arrival of those who come from a distance to offer their compliments to her, attended by her cat and her spirited field-dogs." [2] In relation to the many criticisms of her life at Maubuisson it is well to remember the dictum of Mme. de Nemours, at a period when ladies indulged too freely in tobacco and drink: "Once a person was happy because his coachman was not drunk; now one is happy when one has a daughter-in-law who is not drunk." [3]

One of the chief aims of the Abbess was to win her sister Sophia, the wife of Ernest Augustus, who is not to be confounded with her stepsister of the same name, the wife and Dowager of the late Duke John Frederick. Sophia was the most beautiful as well as the most intellectual of the three sisters of the unfortunate Count Palatine and King of Bohemia. She was the queen of a coterie rather than the Queen of Hanover; her tastes were eclectic. Her stepsister Anne had gone so far as to induce her to pay a visit to Maubuisson. On March 19, 1679, she is asked to come incognito; late in the same year Louise-Hollandine wrote a sorrowful letter over her sister's visit and departure; she came in summer and departed in winter, after a stay of about five or six months; but the bitterest fact was that she departed from Maubuisson unconverted, in spite of the intrigue of Anne and Louise and of the help of Bossuet. She had to suffer an avalanche of letters on her return and an

[1] Cf. Guhrauer, II. 35. [2] Foucher, I. lvii. [3] *Ibid.*, lviii.

unceasing attempt to win her over to the Roman Church, and in her difficulty she chose Leibnitz as her spokesman. When the *Réflexions* of Pelisson were sent to her from Maubuisson, it was to Leibnitz that she turned for assistance. The correspondence with Pelisson grew naturally from this circumstance. She resisted all attempts at her conversion by the continuous advice of Leibnitz, and closed completely with her Catholic correspondents after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which brought from her pen a letter of eloquent indignation. Her love of philosophy and literature, her wit and humanity made her beloved by all her friends. "Her enemies depict her as entirely indifferent in matters of religion. A Calvinistic princess and philosopher, a friend of Thomas Burnet, to whom Collins sent his discourse on Free Thought, whom Toland had the honour of entertaining on several occasions, what an acquisition she was to the free-thinkers, what an opportunity for the lovers of scandal! But they forget that she was protected from the superficial Deism of Toland by the warm piety of Hortensio Mauro and by the immortal *Théodicée* of Leibnitz." [1]

One other lady must be introduced into this portrait gallery. She is the secretary of the Abbess of Maubuisson, the link and intermediary in all the correspondence between Maubuisson and Hanover—Mme. de Brinon. Trained as an Ursuline nun, she retired to Mont-Chevreuil, when her convent was burned down. Mme. de Maintenon secured for her the office of Superior of the House of S. Cyr, but quarrelled with her soon afterwards and had her expelled by order of the King. Louise took pity on her and took her into the Abbey at Maubuisson, where she remained during the remainder of her life. Brinon is inferior in rank and in intellect to the ladies with whom she was brought into close contact; but she was more devout and more completely moved by motives of true religion. The worst that can be said of her is that she is the echo of Bossuet.

When Sophia sent a copy of the "Regulæ" to Maubuisson for communication to Bossuet, the correspondence with Leibnitz, which had burned intermittently until that

[1] Foucher, I. lxi.

moment, burst into a flame.[1] And the ladies helped to keep the flame burning. Maubuisson became the centre of the Reunion Movement; Leibnitz and Bossuet sent their letters via the Abbey,[2] and Brinon assumed the exalted position of intermediary between the champions of Protestantism and Catholicism. Her intermediary position in the correspondence with Pelisson had prepared her mind, and she entered her new position with the greatest vigour and delight. "The Bishop of Meaux," she writes on 5 Sept. 1691 to Leibnitz, "has done me the honour of putting upon me the duty of sending many of his works to you, a thing which I will not fail to do." Her spirit is alive. "I take," she says, "a real interest in the conversion of the Duchess of Hanover. . . . No person is more able than you to set forward such an important matter." [3]

Sophia had sent the "Regulæ" to Bossuet without receiving a reply. "I believe that I sent to the Bishop of Meaux all the articles on which agreement was reached with the Bishop of Neustadt" (16 Sept. 1691).[4] The reminder stirs Bossuet to reply almost at once (29 Sept. 1691). "I well remember," he says, "that the Duchess of Hanover honoured me by sending some time ago the articles on which agreement had been reached with the Bishop of Neustadt; but as this matter did not appear to promise results, I confess that I have allowed these papers to pass out of my sight and that I do not know where to recover them; it would therefore be necessary, should you be willing, to make a very humble request that the Princess would send us once more this scheme of union. For though it may be insufficient in itself, it is very useful as a first step to Reunion, until people are disposed to go further." [5] Bossuet lays down a decisive principle of Reunion from the Catholic side. "Particular caution must be given that the Roman Church, though it may grant concessions according to time and circumstance in matters which are unessential and in matters of discipline, it will never yield any particle of defined doctrine, nor especially that which has been defined by the Council of

[1] Dutens seems to imply that the correspondence began over the Spinola negotiations, cf. I. 509.

[2] Cf. Foucher, I. 269. Leibnitz writes to Brinon 14/24 Oct. 1691: "Je prendray mesme la liberté de l'adresser (sc. cet écrit) à M. l'évesque de Meaux. *Mais ce sera par vostre entremise.*"

[3] Foucher, I. 242. [4] *Ibid.*, 244. [5] *Ibid.*, 245.

Trent." [1] Rome might grant Communion in both kinds to the Lutherans, but, Bossuet adds, "the Constitution of the Church does not allow us to think that any compromise can be made on the basis of defined doctrines; and it is clear that to act otherwise would mean the destruction of the Church's foundations and would cast doubt over all religion." [2]

The loss of the "Regulæ" was soon overcome. Leibnitz despatched another copy from the pen of Molanus to Bossuet. Incidentally he points out the importance of the work of Molanus in the Spinola negotiations. "Immediately we learned," he writes, "that the articles relating to the work of the Bishop of Neustadt, which had been sent previously, were not to be found, Abbot Molanus, who is the first theologian in this country, and who had the largest share in this work, has made another copy. I send his copy to the Bishop of Meaux, and I have not desired to add my own ideas, for it would be rash of me to want to put myself between these two splendid men, in a question which belongs to their own profession." [3] Some interesting sidelights on Spinola's work follow. The glory of the whole affair is that Spinola and Molanus have come to a solution without yielding their respective principles; moreover, "they looked on their scheme merely as a pourparler" [4] for future negotiations, and therefore, in its present state, as incomplete. Leibnitz concludes with an interesting description of the point of view of the theologians at Hanover, but it adds nothing to our knowledge of the Spinola negotiations.[5]

In Nov. and Dec. 1691 Molanus was busy with his great and tolerant thoughts on a method of Reunion (*Cogitationes Privatæ de methodo reunionis ecclesiæ protestantium cum ecclesia romano-catholica*).[6] Absence from Hanover and the onerous work of his position as Head of the Consistories of Hanover had prevented the Abbot from completing his task earlier, but on 17 Dec. 1691 Leibnitz writes in triumph to Mme. de Brinon :[7] "Here is a portion of the work of the Abbot Molanus, the remainder will follow soon." On 28 Dec. he writes again : "I now send you the remainder of this work of explanation, written by the same theologian, who has a

[1] Foucher, I. 245. [2] *Ibid.*, 248. [3] *Ibid.*, 249, 29 Sept. 1691.
[4] *Ibid.*, 251. [5] *Ibid.*, 252 ff. [6] See Appendix, p. 225 ff.
[7] Foucher, I. 284.

tremendous respect for you, but who rightly hopes . . . that it shall not be made public. . . . We shall wait for your opinion, which will give an impetus to this important matter." [1] Bossuet replied on 10 Jan. 1692 : " I received," he writes, " through Mme. de Brinon the letter which you had done me the honour to write. . . . The articles of Abbot Molanus will be, God willing, a great step towards a work so valuable (as the Peace of Christendom)." [2] But apparently he has not yet received the whole work and waits for another opportunity of criticising it.

So far Bossuet was surprised at the apparent Catholicism of Leibnitz. Here was a Protestant who had confessed that the " Regulæ " were good in themselves as a preparatory measure to a fuller project of Reunion; that Rome could make no concessions on doctrine, no matter what she could allow in matters of discipline.[3] Bossuet would test him further. " If you agree so far," he wrote in the letter of 10 Jan. 1692, " you cannot remain long in your present religious position "; [4] and he proceeds to put five test questions to him, with the polite yet politic addition: " If you will take the trouble to answer these five questions with your usual brevity, clarity and candour I trust that you will easily recognise that whatever desire one may have for peace, one is never really peaceful nor in a state of salvation until one is actually reunited with our communion." [5] Such polite gibes are a sure evidence that Bossuet was anxious for Reunion on his own terms.

Leibnitz proceeds with some hesitation to answer the five test questions in a letter (8/18 Jan. 1692).

(1) Does infallibility belong to the General Council alone or does it also appertain to the Body of the Church as a whole? Leibnitz has no answer in face of the conflicting ideas of the Gallicans and the Ultramontanes. " Since in the Roman Church," he writes, " there is no settled agreement as to the subject or root basis of infallibility, some finding it in the Pope, others in the Council, albeit without the Pope . . . it seems to me that the same difficulty would confront us in a democratic State, taking the people outside the assembly of the Estates." [6] There is another difficulty for Leibnitz. Can the modern Church or General Council

[1] Foucher, I. 286. [2] *Ibid.*, 293. [3] *Ibid.*, 250, 296.
[4] *Ibid.*, 296. [5] *Ibid.*, 297. [6] *Ibid.*, 300.

define as a matter of faith something that the past Councils did not consider as such? But he needs further instruction from the Bishop.

(2) Would a man who believes in the infallibility of the General Council in general be sound in conscience if he wanted to cast doubt on the Councils of Nicæa and Chalcedon? Leibnitz thinks that it would be difficult to find an Œcumenical Council if these do not fulfil the lawful conditions. But if a man of good faith has objections it all depends on whether the definitions of these Councils were necessary to salvation before the Council or not; "if the points defined were not necessary before definition, I would say that the conscience of this man is safe." [1]

(3) Would not such permission to dispute any particular General Council open the door to those who would like to ruin the authority of the Church? Leibnitz answers in the negative. There is nothing human which is free from abuse; the best rules cannot avoid deceit. An incompetent judge is not an excuse for rejecting judges in general. A curious illustration follows: "Nothing is more subject to great abuse than torture or the examination of criminals; however, we should find it difficult to dispense with it entirely. A man may protest against a signature which resembles his own and ask for a comparison of signatures; that provides a means of evading the most obvious law; but we could not, nevertheless, withdraw this remedy in general." [2] In conclusion, Leibnitz writes, "I confess that it is dangerous to provide pretexts for casting doubt on the Councils; but it is no less dangerous to give authority to doubtful Councils, and, by that means, to set up a means of endangering truth." [3]

(4) Is the Council of Trent accepted in matters of Faith in France and Germany as it is accepted in Italy and Spain? Leibnitz points to "the opinion of certain doctors of Italy or Spain" (au sentiment de quelques docteurs espagnols ou italiens) who reproach the French for deviating from certain articles of the Council and especially from that concerning the essentials of a valid marriage. This is a matter of doctrine and not merely of discipline. But if the whole doctrine of the Council of Trent should be received in France "it does not follow that it has been received as

[1] Foucher, I. 301. [2] *Ibid.*, 302. [3] *Ibid.*

coming from the Œcumenical Council of Trent, since doubt has so often been cast on the œcumenicity of this Council." [1]

(5) In making certain decrees against Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and against the Confessions of Augsburg, Strassburg and Geneva, did the Council of Trent do anything but propose beliefs which were accepted when Luther began to secede? Were not Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the necessity of Free Will, Reverence of the Saints, Relics, Images, Prayers and Masses for the Dead, and, in short, all the points on which Luther and Calvin quarrelled with the Church, accepted on the threshold of the Reformation? Leibnitz replies that there were many articles of the Council of Trent called in doubt by writers anterior to the Reformation, of which Protestant literature is full. But supposing that all the decisions of Trent were then accepted as true according to the universal opinion, it does not follow that they have always been regarded as true; and the anathemas of Trent have indeed added an entirely novel factor. We are brought at last to the first question as to whether such universal opinions are infallible "and can be regarded as the voice of the Church."

After answering these test questions Leibnitz takes the opportunity of pointing out the main motive of his correspondence; he is ardently in love with Reunion, and he expresses the deepest sentiments of his soul in beautiful language round the tolerant and generous *Thoughts* of Molanus. Bossuet has received the *Cogitationes Privatæ* in full, and Leibnitz has just received news of its reception. He begins his eulogy: "Very great steps are taken in this work to satisfy what was considered to be due to charity and to the love of peace. An approach has been made to the banks of the river Bidassoa to spend a day in Conference Isle. All appearances savouring of dispute have been set aside as well as all airs of superiority which it is the custom to bestow on one's Party." [2] Leibnitz turns to Bossuet: "As you have given reason, in your treatment of public controversies, for the praise that is given to your moderation, what must we not expect from your candour on the question of a reply to people who show such good intentions?" [3]

[1] Foucher, I. 303.

[2] *Ibid.*, 304. The reference is to the meeting of Mazarin and Mendez de Haro, the plenipotentiaries of the Kings of France and Spain, in the Île des Faisans, formed by the River Bidassoa, where a treaty was concluded, Nov. 7, 1659.

[3] *Ibid.*, 304, 305.

The times are propitious. The power of Louis XIV and the attitude of Innocent XI give grounds for hope, and there are other reasons. The Emperor Leopold is a keen man of affairs and an ardent supporter of Reunion; Ernest Augustus of Hanover, a man of personal worth and of authority, who could help forward such a work, takes some part in it. Secular and regular theologians on both sides are working for the removal of obstacles to Reunion, and have approached each other without surrendering their respective principles.

Leibnitz was no longer writing to a correspondent like the Landgrave or Pelisson, who had little power to carry his schemes into practice, but to the greatest Bishop of his age, who was able to set on foot the practical accomplishment of any valuable scheme of Reunion. With what care therefore he addresses the Bishop. "Your fame," he writes, "can add the greatest possible weight to the scheme; and you will remind yourself, without my intervention, that the more one is endowed with powers of doing good, on a large scale, the more one is responsible for one's neglect." [1] "The question is reduced to this essential point from your side: whether the Churches united with Rome would be allowed conscientiously to enter on a union with the Churches assenting to the opinions of the Catholic Church, and ready to come into union with the Roman Hierarchy, but which are not in agreement with certain decisions of the Roman Church; because they are inclined to believe, on great and almost insurmountable evidence on their part, that the Catholic Church has not authorised them; and who also ask for a reformation of the abuses of which Rome herself cannot approve. I do not see that your side will commit any crime by this condescension. It is clear that union can be kept with such people as are wrong without malicious intent." [2] On points of speculation: "It seems to me," says Leibnitz, "that differences exist within the Roman Church which are as important, and perhaps more so, than these." [3]

He makes a final effort to inculcate the true spirit of Reunion. "It is not the time to talk of retractation. We must believe that those on both sides speak with sincerity." [4] When abuses and misunderstandings have been put away and the true spirit has been acquired, the

[1] Foucher, I. 305, 306. [2] *Ibid.*, 306. [3] *Ibid.*, 306. [4] *Ibid.*

Church will be ready to "proceed to a Council, by means of which God may put an end to the remaining evils." [1]

It seems that the answer to this letter is lost, but the sequel will show very clearly what Bossuet thought of the answers to his five test questions.

Meanwhile the greatest hope for Reunion is centred round the work of Molanus, and is expressed in the letters of 1692 and the first half of 1693. Bossuet takes time to prepare his answer. On 5 April 1692, Mme. de Brinon shows the eagerness of the Hanoverian Court to receive the opinion of the Bishop. "Mme. the Duchess of Hanover," she writes to Bossuet, "was beginning to grow impatient because you had not spoken on the works of Molanus." [2] By the 13th of July, 1692, Leibnitz could write: "I am delighted to learn that your reflexions on the work of Molanus are complete." [3] An interesting passage follows on July 27 from Bossuet in which he states the purpose of his forthcoming criticism on the *Cogitationes*. He emphasises the fact that neither the *Cogitationes* nor the *Réflexions* are to be made public,[4] but that everything is to be done as in the past "through the agency of the one you yourself have chosen—Mme. de Brinon." [5] "We look on these works," he continues, "with the same opinion as you, not as documents which must be made public, but as private research on what may be done on one side or the other, and how far concessions may be made without wounding or enfeebling in any way the rights of the Church and the foundations on which the faith of the peoples rests." [6] The *Réflexions sur l'écrit de M. Molanus* were despatched by Bossuet in his letter of 28 August 1692, along with an abridged French translation of the *Cogitationes*.[7]

The *Réflexions* may be summarised in a few words. "The Overtures (of Molanus) are excellent in general"; but Bossuet refuses to accept a preliminary union of Protestants and Catholics until the Faith has been thoroughly discussed and established. However, Mme. de Brinon could write to the Bishop: "I am delighted that you are pleased with

[1] Foucher, I. 307.
[2] *Ibid.*, 340. N.B. The interesting fact about postal arrangements: "la poste d'Allemagne ne part que deux fois la semaine."
[3] *Ibid.*, 372.
[4] See Appendix, p. 334 ff.
[5] *Ibid.*, 374.
[6] Foucher, I. 374.
[7] See Appendix, p. 231.

the Abbot Molanus; he is a man in whom the Duchess of Hanover has the greatest trust." [1] And Bossuet himself expressed his feelings to Leibnitz as follows: "We must seek Reunion on the sole basis of holding fast the great principle of the infallibility of the Church; . . . and the work of Molanus is a great stimulus to this design." [2]

A realistic picture of the reception of the *Réflexions* is drawn by Leibnitz. "I gave them," he writes on the 1st of Oct. 1692, "first to Molanus, and we looked over them together at once with that eagerness which the author, the subject and our own expectation had produced. But we realised very clearly that such deep and solid thoughts must be read over and over again with much attention." [3] Molanus is delighted that the Bishop has shown such a spirit of conciliation, and together they look forward to further steps towards the goal on which their hopes are fixed.

Molanus framed a reply which was finished soon after Sept. 1693 (*Explicatio ulterior methodi Reunionis ecclesiasticæ*),[4] in which he attests his joy at the reception of the *Réflexions* and at the somewhat surprising concessions of Bossuet. Unfortunately, however, a new turn had been given to the correspondence between Bossuet and Leibnitz. Their approach to a scheme of Reunion along the lines of the "Regulæ" and the *Cogitationes* had delighted the Court of Hanover during the early 'nineties, but bitterness and regret were at the doors. The efforts for Reunion became on Bossuet's part a plot for the conversion of Leibnitz, and on Leibnitz's part a growing disgust towards the Church he would have been delighted to enter on terms which would leave him a clear conscience. It is sufficient to notice that the Church of Rome has never received a more liberal offer from Protestantism than that of the theologians of the Court of Ernest Augustus of Hanover.

Signs of the coming disaster are evident in the replies of Leibnitz to the test questions of Bossuet. His whole policy was to find a way for the inclusion of Protestants within the Church of Rome without a sacrifice of principle, and his specific method of finding that way was to prove that the Council of Trent was not œcumenical. His whole religious correspondence is dominated by his attempt to widen the circle drawn by the Roman Church; with the Landgrave

[1] Foucher, I. 342. [2] *Ibid.*, 376. [3] *Ibid.*, 388. [4] *Ibid.*, 508.

he had attempted to do it by means of the conception of an Inner Communion; with Pelisson he had pressed the Catholic idea of material heresy as opposed to formal heresy; with Bossuet he used all the historical incidents of Church history to support his dominant aim, and found at last that he was not at a conference helping to make peace, but that he was in the presence of a fortress which was so strongly equipped against the Protestants that the only alternative was to use every available weapon to take it by storm. That fortress was the Council of Trent with its hard decrees and uncompromising anathemas.

He would, however, resort first to persuasion. His method is entirely different from that of the previous correspondences; he remains almost entirely within the field of Church history for his arguments. The Conciliar Period is his favourite epoch, and the most frequently repeated incident in that period is the case of the Calixtines of Bohemia. "You see," he writes to Bossuet 18 April, 1692, "from the executory letter of the Deputies of the Council of Basel, which I add below, that when the Calixtines of Bohemia were admitted into the Council a well-known decree of the Council of Constance was suspended on their behalf; namely, that which decides that the use of the two kinds is not compulsory on all the faithful. Pope Eugenius and the Council of Basel did not compel the Calixtines, who did not recognise the authority of the Council of Constance nor were in agreement with this decree, to assent to it, but referred the matter to another future decision of the Church. They established one condition only, that the Calixtines, again united to the Church, should believe in what is called concomitance or the Presence of Jesus Christ in entirety under each kind, and, in consequence, should admit that Communion under one kind is complete and valid, as it were without being bound to believe that it is lawful. These Concordats between the Deputies of the Council and those of the Calixtine States of Bohemia and Moravia were ratified by the Council of Basel. Pope Eugenius showed his delight by a letter which he wrote to the Bohemians; Leo X, long after, also declared his approval and Ferdinand promised to uphold the Concordats." [1] Leibnitz leaps to his conclusion. "Consider, sir," he writes after reviewing

[1] Foucher, I. 343, 344.

the respective sections of the Christian Church, "if that very large section of the Church which speaks the German language is not at least as worthy of the same complaisance as that bestowed on the Bohemians." [1] Leibnitz frequently returns to this argument with its obvious intention of winning consideration for the Protestants, or, as he himself expressed it: "The Protestant party is so considerable that we must do everything possible for them." [2]

He turns to the Conciliar Period for another argument in support of his thesis. The Protestants must be shown the same consideration which the Council of Florence showed to the Greeks. "To desire to make decrees for the whole Church without their participation does not seem quite fair nor satisfactory as a practical policy, and it would be wiser to imitate Eugenius IV in his method of discussing the question of Peace; he did not proudly reject the Greeks . . . nor command them to appear under hostile decrees, but admitted them into the Council of Florence itself that they might pronounce their opinion." [3]

Protestantism was accused of changing the Faith of the Church against the Catholic principle that decisions and decrees have always been in harmony with what was already fixed. Leibnitz pleaded for the critical spirit in Protestantism by quoting the history of image worship. "What shall we say of the second Council of Nicæa," he asks, "which your friends would hold up as an Œcumenical Council? Did it find the worship of images established? Very far from it. Irene had just established it by force; image worshippers and image breakers prevailed in turn; and the Council of Frankfort which held the mean position was formally opposed to the Council of Nicæa on behalf of France, Germany, and Britain. To-day the Church of France seems to be sufficiently removed from the opinions of her forefathers assembled in Council, who would have protested aloud if they could have seen what is often practised now in their Churches." [4] Leibnitz pulls himself up; he must apologise to the Bishop; "I ask pardon," he writes, "for the liberty that I take in telling you these things." [5] But he has helped to remove a further obstacle from the way of the Protestants, and he is not ashamed of

[1] Foucher, I. 344. [2] *Ibid.*, 343. [3] Dutens, I. 536. Annotationes.
[4] Foucher, I. 390. [5] *Ibid.*

speaking truly and sincerely on matters which may be distasteful to the other side.

To these arguments he adds the general pleas for Protestantism as an attempt to remedy abuses and to return to the authority of reason, Scripture and the Universal Church.[1]

As the correspondence between Leibnitz and Bossuet continued it became obvious that all forces were leading to a decisive battle round the Council of Trent. Leibnitz realised it as early as 23 Oct. 1693, when he wrote to Brinon: "If it is thought that a perfect agreement on all the decisions of Trent can be obtained, it is farewell to Reunion. It is the opinion of the Abbot of Lockum that no thought should be given to such a submission." [2] A constant recurring phrase throughout this part of the correspondence is "Trent—the obstacle to Reunion."

Bossuet defended his position with the old dogmatic weapons of the Church. Presuppositions were more important to him than historical evidence. "In order to give a clear and final solution to the doubts proposed on the Council of Trent," he writes between June and October 1693, "we must presuppose certain principles." "First, that the infallibility which Jesus Christ promised to His Church rests originally in the whole Body; since that is the Church which is built on the rock and to which the Son of God promised that the Gates of Hell should not prevail against her. Secondly, that this infallibility, in so far as it consists in teaching, and not merely in receiving the Truth, resides in the pastoral Order, which of necessity succeeds . . . the Apostles; since it is to this Order that Jesus Christ promised his perpetual presence, when he said, 'Go teach, baptize; I am with you always'; which undoubtedly means with you, who teach and baptize, and with your successors. . . . Thirdly, that the bishops or chief pastors who have not been ordained by and in this succession have no share in the promise because they do not come within the source of Apostolic Ordination, which is essentially perpetual and continuous, that is to say, without a break; otherwise the saying 'I am with you always even to the end of the world' would be in vain. Fourthly, that (those who renounce the faith of those who ordained them), though they retain the

[1] Foucher, I. 508. [2] *Ibid.*, 520.

reality of their Orders, which their infidelity cannot destroy, yet they cannot keep their authority, which rests in the succession, and continuity, which we have just established. Fifthly, that (true bishops and pastors) may bear witness to their faith either by their unanimous message in the Church, as dispersed throughout the world, or by an express decision in a legitimate assembly. In both cases their authority is equally infallible, their doctrine equally sure: in the first case because infallibility is affixed to this externally dispersed body as united by the Holy Ghost; in the second case because this Assembly or Council, whch represents the infallible body, enjoys the same privilege and can say after the example of the Apostles: 'It has seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' Sixthly, the last sign that we may have that this Council or Assembly represents in reality the Catholic Church is when the whole body of the Episcopate, and the whole community which professes to accept its commands, approves of and receives it; that is the final seal of the authority of this Council and of the infallibility of its decrees. . . ." Bossuet concludes with an imperative word to workers for Reunion. "Those who will not agree to these principles must never hope for Reunion with us because they will never agree, except superficially, to the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, which is the only sound principle for the Reunion of Christendom." [1]

To this principle Bossuet held firm. Leibnitz, on the other hand, attacked the fortress with all the arguments that history could supply. Bossuet must have felt ruffled by the curt reply to his six principles. "To be short," writes Leibnitz, "I do not want to examine the six principles, which are not free from obscurity and doubt, perhaps even on the part of those who advance them, or at least among their party, although they be given with much wisdom and skill." [2] He prefers the historical to the "a priori" argument.

The severest and most prolonged attack is made on the Council because of its failure to win universal acceptance. This is especially true of the terse and telling *Réponse de Leibniz au Mémoire de l'Abbé Pirot :* [3] a work which could not have been written without access to a full and valuable library. But the correspondence must be studied as a whole

[1] Foucher, I. 488 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, 508. [3] *Ibid.*, 452 ff.

for a correct estimate of Leibnitz's attitude on this subject. His first expression of opinion on the defective reception of Trent appeared in the letter to Brinon, 7/17 June 1691. France, he says, has not received the decrees of Trent in relation to discipline (ob mores); and the decrees in relation to faith (ob fidem) are accepted on grounds independent of the authority of the Council. "Besides, neither France nor Germany has made a national declaration by which the Council of Trent may be accepted as œcumenical; rather the contrary is the case . . . perhaps Providence has wished to leave this door open in order to procure Reunion by the hope of a more authoritative Council, which may thoroughly uproot the Great Schism of the West." [1] Leibnitz returns to this subject in almost every succeeding letter to Brinon,[2] as if to imply that Bossuet must be constantly reminded of this vital "argumentum ad hominem." On 16 July 1691, he adds some illuminating remarks: "and in Germany, the Province of Mayence, to which the bishops of this neighbourhood belong, has not yet received the Council as œcumenical. We are indebted to France for having preserved the liberty of the Church against the infallibility of the Popes; but for this, I believe that the greater part of the West would have already passed under the yoke." [3] The question is lifted into the more general consideration of the relation of the Reception of Councils to the Unity of the Church. Catholic countries which do not accept the Council of Trent are not separated, in their ecclesiastical relationship, from countries which accept its decrees, *e.g.* "Italy recognises certain Councils as œcumenical, and France others; each nation adheres to the decisions of the Council of which it approves . . . without treating those of the opposite party as heretics . . . so that, if the north of Europe were reunited with the rest under the Roman Hierarchy, in the same way as Italy and France, the diverse opinions of these two great parties on the Council and Decrees of Trent would be no more incompatible with Church Unity than those in France and Italy on the decisions of the Councils of Constance, Basel, the last Lateran and even of other Councils." [4]

[1] Foucher, I. 233.
[2] *Ibid.*, 161, 165, 179, 231, 233, 237, 243, 264, 332, 368 (1st edit.); II. 34, 38.
[3] *Ibid.*, 237. Cf. Rommel, II. 444. [4] *Ibid.*, II. 33, 34.

Leibnitz devotes special care to the historical evidence for the attitude of France towards Trent. He announces a discovery to Pelisson on 19 Nov. 1692: "I have discovered the curious fact," he writes, "that the Declaration of Faith, which the French prelates drew up for Henry IV at S. Denys, was article by article and word for word in agreement with that of Pius IV, excepting in the two only passages which refer to the Council of Trent." [1] Henry IV had returned to the Roman Church on 17 Sept. 1595. A fuller description is given to the Duchess of Hanover on 2 July, 1694: "I have noted a very important fact, which authors have overlooked in silence. When Henry IV was reconciled to the Church of France . . . he asked the Archbishop of Bourges and other prelates . . . to draw up for him a formulary of the Faith. . . . They enjoined on him the above-mentioned declaration of Pope Pius IV, but not without striking out purposely the two passages in which reference is made to the Council of Trent." [2] This is manifest proof "that though they held the same faith in France as that taught by the Council, yet they did not recognise the Council itself as a rule of Faith." [3]

The attitude of France, as studied in the *Mémoires* of M. du Puy, proves that there was opposition within the Council itself. M. Amiot read the protestation of Henry II in which "The King declared his belief that the Assembly under Jules III was a Conciliabule and not a General Council." [4] The Council was totally unaware of the coming of this message, and there were no French representatives at the six sessions under Jules. Another protestation was made under the presidency of Pius IV, when the Pope's favouritism of the representatives from Spain caused the French to retire to Venice; France was moreover shocked at the disregard of the Council for the Gallican Liberties. "It is true that the French prelates remained in the Council and gave their consent to its decisions and even to those which had been drawn up under Jules III"; [5] but the ambassadors of the King were in violent opposition. The bitter speech prepared by M. du Ferrier is sufficient proof, although it was not delivered. The decrees were said to have been decided at Rome rather than at Trent, and to

[1] Foucher, I. 404. [2] *Ibid.*, II. 41. [3] *Ibid.*, 271.
[4] *Ibid.*, I. 457. [5] *Ibid.*, 458.

savour more of the whims of Pius IV than of the Council; "the Most Christian King will not accept them nor will the Gallican Church regard them as decrees of an Œcumenical Council." [1] France was therefore opposed to the œcumenicity of the Council of Trent.

Leibnitz pours scorn on the Council itself. He wrote to the Landgrave, 20/10 July 1692: "I do not see how we can regard the Council of Trent as œcumenical, since it was fundamentally merely a Council or Synod of Italians; it is not sufficient to say that others were summoned; in great questions more than one summons is necessary; if, during a vacancy in the Empire, the Elector of Mayence summoned the other Electors to an election, and they had, or alleged that they had, important reasons for not appearing, he could not appoint an emperor by himself or at one single gathering." [2] In a later letter to Bossuet stronger expressions are used. "Your communion flatters itself in vain," he writes, "as if permission was given to a gang of small Italian Bishops, partisans and nurselings of Rome, . . . to frame decrees in a corner of the Alps which were to be binding on the whole Church, if we desired to believe them. No, sir, such a Council will not be allowed without inflicting an incurable wound on the Christian Church." [3]

The whole question of the composition and method of the Council is treated at length in the *Réponse* to Pirot; Leibnitz adds further complaints against the prejudiced Fathers of Trent. "It looks," he says, "as though they even wanted to take advantage of the favourable time . . . when the Protestants and almost all the northern nations were not present, as well as the Greeks and Orientals; when there was a King of Spain infatuated by the monks and of opinions far removed from those of his father the Emperor, and when France was governed by an Italian woman and by princes of the House of Lorraine. . . ." [4] They had the power of the Church entirely in their own hands, unlike the Councils of Constance and Basel, in which the other nations balanced the authority of the Italians. Decisions were made without any consideration for other

[1] Foucher, I. 458.
[2] Rommel, II. 431. The numbers given by Rommel are 281 prelates, of whom 187 were Italian, 26 French, 2 German.
[3] Foucher, II. 259.
[4] *Ibid.*, I. 465.

sections of the Church; "Rome shouted for joy . . . at having retained her authority entire"; [1] but the hope of reconciliation was gone; abuses lengthened their roots; superstition grew; Providence turned to France for the hope of a future solution to the difficulties which Trent had inflicted on the Church.

Leibnitz could not but pass from a criticism of the method and procedure of Trent to a criticism of its decrees.[2] He was confident that Trent had increased the ills of the Church. Nothing was clear in its "Acta" except the Anathemas; Roman Catholics were hopelessly divided among themselves as to its real import, and only a new Council could clear matters up. The Anathemas, more numerous than in any previous Council, had produced fanatics instead of quiet consciences, chiefly because they were attached to the novel additions of the Council's teaching on Faith and Doctrine. "We must cling to tradition and to antiquity without claiming to know and to prescribe for others, under pain of damnation, articles which the Church has not needed for so many centuries and of which the saints and chief men of Christian antiquity were unaware. Why make the yoke of the Faithful heavier and the Reunion of the Protestants more difficult?" [3] Leibnitz would later engage in a final struggle with Bossuet on a particular aspect of this question. "What need was there to put the History of Judith and other similar books in the Canon?" [4]

"The Reunion of Protestants" with the Church of Rome —that was the underlying motive of all his arguments. If he argues against Trent as a Council in which the Pope and the Italians were absolute; or if he makes his attack on the grounds of the failure of the Council to receive universal reception, the underlying and concealed motive is that Protestantism may receive consideration, and that the path may be cleared for a truly universal Church. He is fond of quoting the attitude of Catherine de Medici towards the Council. "As a reason for her refusal to accept the Council she urged that it would prevent the Reunion of the Protestants . . . a proof that she wanted a Council which could give more satisfaction to the Protestants." [5] And Leibnitz

[1] Foucher, I. 465. [2] Pichler, II. 303. [3] Foucher, I. 474.
[4] *Ibid.* [5] *Ibid.*, 463, 464.

was of the same opinion. Nothing could save Christendom but another Council, in which Greeks and Protestants had a share His latest utterances were all of this kind. During 1702 he wrote: "Protestants as well as all those who really love the honour of God and the welfare of the Church are bound to reject such a Council for ever; if it was regarded as œcumenical we could trust no longer in Œcumenical Councils nor in the stable tradition of antiquity . . . there could be no greater rashness and folly than to utter an anathema against the whole ancient Church, arising as it does from a mere hatred of the Protestants, without a sign of reason or necessity. But God has confounded the false wisdom of these forgers of a so-called universal Council, in order to put posterity under the necessity of abandoning them." [1] One single path lies open: Trent must be abandoned. "If Trent is abandoned," he wrote to Fabricius on 17 Mar. 1712, "the settlement of the Schism would be easier, but as long as this Council is considered there can be no union except by force." [2]

Cardinal Bousset said of the *Réflexions sur l'écrit de M. Molanus* that such concessions had never been made by a prelate of such commanding position.[3] But it was obvious that "the way of explanation" adopted by Bossuet was based on uncompromising principles. "As for the advances," he wrote to Leibnitz on 12 August 1701, "which you seem to expect of us in matters of dogma, I have often answered you that the Roman Constitution will allow of none except by way of exposition and declaration. . . . Religious matters are not to be handled like temporal affairs, which are regulated by concessions on both sides, because these are matters over which men are their own masters. But matters of Faith rest on revelation." [4] This objectivity of dogma applies also to the decisions of the Church; if Leibnitz therefore takes the question into the subjective aspects of theology, learned controversy, or of diplomacy, or even into the realm of historical criticism, Bossuet holds out to him the objectivity and honour of the Church, whose servant he is.[5] "Feeling his inferiority in the presence of the German thinker, he turned round and

[1] Foucher, II. 448. [2] Pichler, II. 317. [3] Guhrauer, II. 50.
[4] Foucher, II. 385, 386. [5] Guhrauer, II. 51 ff.

round incessantly in his vicious circle on the Infallibility of the General Councils and the necessity of their reception by all within the Catholic Church." [1] His boundaries were fixed. "Be assured," he wrote to Leibnitz on 15 August 1693, "that Trent is a fixed point beyond which our side will not go . . . we must set bounds to these discussions when matters have reached a certain stage of elucidation." [2] Trent was "un fait accompli." Leibnitz put the matter in a nutshell when he wrote to Bossuet, 3 Sept. 1700, "You always suppose that we acknowledge the decisions of the Church and after that you infer that we must not touch such decisions." [3]

The surprising thing is that the correspondence was continued so long.[4] It was evident in the latter half of 1693 that a breach was at hand. The hopes of the previous years faded before the insistent refusal of Bossuet to discuss the merits of the Council of Trent. On the same day that he had written his sentiments to Mme. de Brinon (23 Oct. 1693) Leibnitz wrote to Bossuet in an unusual tone of despair. He had bidden adieu to Reunion on the principle of accepting Trent; and to Bossuet he wrote, "I know that you always prefer sincerity to the fine words of the world which the heart disavows"; [5] and proceeds to tell him of the pain which his letter had given to him and especially to Molanus. "We were especially surprised," he continues, "at the way in which our opinions have been regarded recently in the reply which I received on the reception of the Council of Trent; as if we were bound to submit to all the principles of the Roman party, when we said that a reasonable Reunion should be arranged on the condition of binding neither party to quit in advance their principles." [6] Bossuet had shot his last arrow.

There can be no doubt about the cause of this sudden breach, which lasted from 15 August 1693 until 11 Jan. 1699, with one unimportant message from Bossuet on 12 Aug. 1694. "Bossuet absolutely refused an explanation of the proposed suspension (of the Council's decrees) and by

[1] Pichler, II. 298. [2] Foucher, I. 505. [3] *Ibid.*, II. 372.
[4] It was entirely due to Leibnitz that it did not break before; cf. Pichler, II. 301.
[5] Foucher, I. 521. [6] *Ibid.*, 522.

this refusal was the author of the breach." [1] This fact is attested by numerous passages. Leibnitz gives a vivid description of the attitude of Catholics like Bossuet in his letter to Brinon on 30 May 1694. "They say," he writes, "that the Church decided these controversies in the Council of Trent; we hold that the Church is infallible; therefore we could not leave in suspense controversies which have already been decided." But there are Catholics who doubt the Council of Trent and other Councils; facts which Bossuet has not denied, directly; "he has, however, sought a subterfuge in order to avoid them." [2] A further impression is given in a letter to Prince Anton Ulrich, 7/17 Nov. 1698. "As for the main question," he writes, "Bossuet avoided giving an explanation with his accustomed clarity and to some extent put us off the scent. It was in vain that I urged him by trying to show where we asked for more explanation and by furnishing him with all the documents which he required in order to make a good reply; this reply, however, did not arrive, though it seemed to have been promised a second time." [3] Bossuet had no reply to make to the appeal of Leibnitz for the suspension of the decrees of Trent and for a new discussion on matters of controversy at a later and more representative Council. As far as he was concerned the ultimate boundary had been reached.

Other explanations of the breach are unsatisfactory. Pichler puts it down to the pride of Bossuet. "The cause (of the breach) is clear to me," he says: "Bossuet considered it impossible that he could learn anything in the sphere of theology, where he reigned as undisputed monarch, from the clever young German scholar, who was a Protestant and a layman." [4] He thought it a foregone conclusion that Leibnitz would be an easy prey to his controversial skill and would prepare the way for the conversion of Germany. When Leibnitz turned upon the Bishop with a torrent of questions and a library of specialised knowledge, the haughty Bossuet felt bound to retire. Such an explanation does not satisfy all the facts; it does not take account of the fact

[1] Foucher, I. lxviii. [2] *Ibid.*, II. 33.
[3] See Foucher, I. lxviii. for a complete list of references to the cause of the breach.
[4] Pichler, II, 451.

that the correspondence was taken up again by Bossuet with great zest; and it is far too personal to satisfy the evidence from the letters themselves, which illustrate a slow but steady emergence of opposing principles.

Bossuet has given his own apology. He pleaded that he had kept all the correspondence with great care,[1] and became indignant at any suggestion of his own guilt in the breach. "You seem to insinuate," he wrote on 11 Jan. 1699, in his reopening letter, "that this correspondence was suddenly broken off from my side without your knowing the real cause for it. I assure you that it is unnecessary to seek any other cause than the war, during which I thought that it was not convenient to discuss religion and Reunion. Now that God has given us peace I praise His infinite goodness that He has put into your heart the desire to take this matter up again."[2] He blames the war, which broke out in 1695. But the war was over before 1699. Why did he prolong his delay? And the letters of 1693 prior to the rupture are obviously leading to an immediate divergence. Foucher will not be trapped by this faint apology. His words are interesting: "It is true that the war broke out about 1695. But was the war more the motive for stopping this religious correspondence than politics? . . . If France is silent when Bossuet speaks, must Bossuet be silent because the cannon commence to groan? Did the Catholic Bishop receive his instructions exclusively from the political ruler of his country or did he allow Diplomacy to be the absolute Mistress in the direction of questions which concern the conscience?"[3] What excuse had Bossuet later for his failure to reply to the letter of Leibnitz dated 5 Feb. 1702?

It is clear that the cause lay neither in the circumstances of the time, nor in mere personal feelings; it was a question of principles. Bossuet was convinced that no Reunion was possible save on the stabilising decrees of the Council of Trent; Leibnitz was convinced that Reunion depended entirely on the suspension of these decrees and on a return to the doctrine of the ancient Church with the inclusion of

[1] Foucher, II. 390.
[2] *Ibid.*, 232, 233.
[3] Foucher, I. lxix. Another reason has been given in a *breach of secrecy* on Bossuet's part. But Leibnitz confesses that he was not guilty of such discourtesy (see *ibid.* lxvii. for discussion). The death of Pelisson in Jan. 1693 seems to have had some effect on the divergence.

Protestants and Greeks in the Church Catholic. Bossuet was satisfied with Trent; Leibnitz looked forward to a more representative Council.

The correspondence was not at an end, however. Leibnitz had been careful to keep in touch with Brinon throughout the breach, and was delighted when Bossuet broke silence again in the above-quoted letter of 11 Jan. 1699. "I am delighted," he wrote in answer, "to learn of the continuation of your kindness towards me and especially of the persistence of your zeal for the advancement of the great work of the peace of the Church." [1] The revival of the correspondence led to the severest struggle of all—over the attitude of the Council of Trent to the Deutero-canonical books (1699–1702).

Bossuet's letter of 11 Jan. had revived the hopes of Leibnitz; but the manner of Bossuet is a further proof that Leibnitz was the more ardent correspondent. The Bishop received several enthusiastic letters during the course of 1699, but it was not until 9 Jan. 1701 that he broke silence again. Prince Anton Ulrich had approached Leibnitz for the opinion of Bossuet on the recently published work of a Roman controversialist, F. Veron. "When I arrived here (Wolfenbüttel) some days ago," wrote Leibnitz on 11 Dec. 1699, "the Duke Anton Ulrich asked me if I had heard from you; and when I told him that I had not had the honour of hearing from you for some time, he said that he would provide the means for making you remember us." [2] He encloses a copy of Veron's book for Bossuet's judgment. From this introduction he plunges into the great question of the distinguishing principles between what is of faith and what is not, and between different degrees of faith. And in doing so he introduces the controversy over the Canon. "As many things are regarded to-day as being of Faith," he writes, "which are not sufficiently revealed by Scripture, nor by apostolic tradition; as, for example, the canonicity of the books which the Protestants hold as Apocryphal, and which are held to-day as of Faith in your Communion against the opinion of those in authority in the ancient Church." [3] What is the principle by which to distinguish Faith from unfaith? Had the Council of Trent the right to receive the Apocrypha into the Canon and to cast an

[1] Foucher, II. 234. [2] *Ibid.*, 274. [3] *Ibid.*, 275.

anathema against the Protestants or not? Cardinal Bousset has to confess surprise at the learning and historical research of Leibnitz in the letters of the 14 and 24 May 1700.[1] "The correspondence on this question falls at a time . . . when Leibnitz was in possession of the most copious knowledge of theology and especially of Church history." [2]

He was defending a principle; and his energy was redoubled by the fact that this principle once granted the Council of Trent fell into desuetude. "If we grant to the Church," he wrote, "the right to establish new Articles of Faith, we shall abandon perpetuity as the recognised mark of the Catholic Faith." [3] The Bishops and the Pope cannot forge new dogmas on the Faithful, in opposition to the teaching of the Early Church. They had no right to assign canonicity to the Apocryphal books.

Bossuet does not seem to have realised the attitude which Leibnitz adopted to this fundamental question; "the light which his letter (the answer to Leibnitz, dated 9 Jan. 1700) contains might perhaps have offered something new to a young theological student, or to a layman entirely ignorant of theological matters"; [4] but to Leibnitz it was an insult. In 24 sections he attempts to prove that "the doubt on the canonicity of the Deutero-canonical books according to the Decree of the Council of Trent can no longer be allowed." The argument from perpetuity has no force, because, says Bossuet, the books have always been accepted; so that "the definition of the Council of Trent on the canonicity of the Scriptures, far from binding us to recognise new revelations, shows on the contrary that the Catholic Church remains always inviolably bound up with ancient tradition." [5] The Church has merely declared "more clearly, more authentically, more forcibly" (plus expressément, plus authentiquement, plus fortement), in the face of more stubborn opposition, what was her real mind on this matter, just as she has declared on other truths. Leibnitz answered on 30 April 1700: "I am sorry not to be able to acknowledge you victorious without wounding my conscience; for, after examining the question with care, it seems to me undeniable that the opinion of S. Jerome was that of the Early Church, until the time of the modern innovations

[1] Guhrauer, II. 60. [2] Pichler, II. 207. [3] Foucher, II. 276.
[4] Pichler, II. 208. [5] Foucher, II. 287.

made by your party, chiefly at Trent." [1] Popes Innocent and Gelasius, the Council of Carthage and S. Augustine used the terms "canonical" and "divine" in reference to these books in the wider sense that their contents were not opposed to the inspired and revealed word of God. In no other sense can they be understood without deviating from the whole teaching of the Early Church. But Trent went one step further in its novelties. "I see no way," writes Leibnitz with indignation, "of excusing those who ruled this Council from the reproach of having dared to pronounce an anathema against the doctrine of the whole ancient Church. I am much mistaken if that will ever be tolerated unless by a strange revolution we revert to savagery, or by a divine judgment something worse than ignorance should rule in the Church; for, I confess, the truth seems very clear on this point. It is tolerable if Trent and Rome made a mistake, but they must erase the anathemas, which are the most curious things in the world, on a matter where it seems impossible for those who are not prejudiced to be able to give conscientious acquiescence." [2] The whole letter is an expression of the deepest feelings of Leibnitz. If Bossuet refuses to accept this point of view, all thoughts of Reunion must pass away and the wounds of the Church will remain open.

On 14 May 1700 (continued 24 May) Leibnitz answered the 24 points of Bossuet by 122 of his own, in which he sketched the history of the Canon and the views of the Church on the Apocryphal books down to the Council of Trent.[3] He accepts the Protestant position that these books are good and useful without placing them on the level of the Canon; and takes his stand with Gerhardt, Chemnitz, Calixtus, and other apologists against the novelties of Trent. He emphasises the fact that the Greeks are one in this matter with the Protestants.

A few passages will show the trend of his argument. The Fathers at Trent were moved to place the Apocryphal books in the Canon "by spite alone, against the Protestants"; [4]

[1] Foucher, II. 306, 307. [2] *Ibid.*, 307.

[3] It is important to remember that Leibnitz did not attack the contents of the Apocryphal books, but only the principle recognised at Trent that they were to be regarded in the same way as the Canon.

[4] Foucher, II. 324.

unlike the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, who described these books as "divine" and "canonical" from very different motives. "We see in this," he continues, "in a good example how errors take root and creep into the Church. The terms are first changed with a readiness, harmless in itself, but dangerous in its sequel; and at last these terms are misused in order to change the opinions themselves, when errors are favourable to popular leanings and ruling passions." [1] After showing the historical untenableness of the Tridentine anathema he turns to Bossuet with these words: "Where are those great and splendid promises now—those customary promises of the 'semper et ubique' of truths called Catholic? . . . It is impossible to conceive how the continuous tradition on a dogma of Faith can be more distinct, eleven or twelve centuries after, than it was in the third and fourth centuries of the Church; since any century can only receive it from all the preceding centuries." [2]

Leibnitz cannot tolerate Bossuet's view of Scripture as a whole, namely that the knowledge of Scripture is "not absolutely necessary, since there are people who have no Scriptures, to whom oral teaching or tradition supply the defect." "But we must also confess," adds Leibnitz, "that without the special help of God oral tradition could not pass down the centuries without perishing, or without being strangely corrupted, as examples of all the traditions in connection with secular history, law, popular customs, and even the arts and sciences, clearly show." [3] Providence therefore took advantage of natural means as He was unwilling to increase the operation of the miraculous, and used "Holy Scripture as the best means of safeguarding the genuineness of religion against the corruption of the times." [4] The anathemas of Scripture against those who add to or subtract from this primal revelation are sufficient to show the importance of God's purpose. If anathemas were to be pronounced it seems that the Protestants had the greater right to make them; but moderation leads them to ask only why Trent has received another Canon, and to state that the opposition of Trent to the whole stream of tradition is "the greatest sign of rebellion and schism that could be given." [5]

[1] Foucher, II. 324. [2] *Ibid.*, 330. [3] *Ibid.*, 335, 336.
[4] *Ibid.*, 336. [5] *Ibid.*, 339.

For the historical evidence behind these statements it would be necessary to read the whole work; and indeed no student of the Canon can dispense with these most valuable researches from the Library of Hanover.

Bossuet required fifteen months to digest these tough statements. On 17 August 1701 he began a feeble reply with this preface: "I did not expect to have to discuss this matter further with you after laying down my principles; for to descend to details on this question is not our purpose and would not result in anything but a further controversy." [1] A tone of injured vanity runs through the whole letter. He could prove no more than "an immemorial tradition" for the decision of Trent. It is the letter of a sick man.[2]

Until Foucher edited the theological works of Leibnitz it was thought that Leibnitz broke off the correspondence and was therefore the weaker correspondent. Dutens gave credence to this view by closing his collection with Bossuet's letter of 17 August 1701, and Guhrauer fixed it firmly by his brilliant biography. Writers as renowned as Hefele or as the clever Austrian theologian, Werner, were foolish enough to repeat this error even after Foucher had destroyed it by his discovery of the letter of Leibnitz dated 5 Feb. 1702.

This final letter shows the completeness of the division between Leibnitz and Bossuet. It is a series of "Observations" on the sixty-two statements of the "Bishop of Meaux." [3] The whole is in the third person, with the exception of a short covering note. The new feature about it is of great interest. Leibnitz passes from his argument on the tradition of the Early Church to the argument of biblical criticism. "In order to fix the Canon of Divine books," he writes, "we must add the rules of ordinary criticism to the consideration of the leading of Providence." [4]

[1] Foucher, II. 396.

[2] Bossuet was obviously tired and ill at this time; cf. Foucher, I. lxxiii: "Bossuet, déjà vieux, fatigué, mais non vaincu du temps et des disputes." He died 12 April 1704.

[3] Foucher, II. 428 ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, 437. Foucher has a splendid account of the relation of Leibnitz to the Aufklärung and the critical movement within the Church (II. lxxiv). He does not say that the new movement was directly due to Leibnitz, but he sees the tendencies of it in the criticism on the Canon. (The tiny seed grew into a great tree.) In the hands of Leibnitz it was balanced by several great Catholic principles and was saved from excesses.

With this letter the correspondence ended. Bossuet died soon afterwards, and the virile Leibnitz entered on further schemes for the fulfilment of his cherished ideal of Reunion.

The discovery of this last letter fills the vacuum which existed before the researches of Foucher de Careil were made in the archives of Hanover. The keen spirit of Leibnitz, who had repeatedly asked Bossuet to continue the correspondence, which he was so fond of breaking off, was not likely to yield without writing the last word. And to a Frenchman belongs the honour of revealing that word to the world.

As he wrote it, Leibnitz must have glanced in retrospect over the twenty-four years' correspondence with the Bishop. With what enthusiasm had he set out "to promote the great work of Reunion . . . and to stay those grave evils, like the loss of thousands of souls and the shedding of so much Christian blood, due to the schism." [1] Until 1693 there seemed to be every possibility of an understanding; but with the removal of Pelisson and the growing persecutions of the Protestants in France, and, above all, with the inevitable elaboration of principles by the two writers, there came a distinct breach. Bossuet assumed an air of superiority; he refused to write except by strong persuasion; he became proud and cold. Leibnitz forsook his early spirit of friendliness and took the offensive with great vigour.[2] That he continued the correspondence so long is proof that he placed more weight on principles than on persons. If he could not succeed in his generation, he would work for posterity. And posterity has been privileged to preserve more of his works than he himself could ever have hoped.

But it would be misleading to place this correspondence entirely in the personal sphere.[3] Bossuet was a man under authority; he stood for Rome. It is true that Leibnitz had less compulsion from without; but on the whole he represented the liberal Protestant school of Calixtus, Molanus and the University of Helmstadt, as revealed in such documents as the "Regulæ," and the *Cogitationes*. The correspondence began as an attempt to unite these two schools

[1] Foucher, II. 265. [2] See *ibid.*, II. lxxxvi.
[3] As Foucher is too inclined to do, see "Causes psychologiques" (II. lxxxv).

of thought; it ended in the discovery of the principles which divided them.

The ardent spirit of Leibnitz and the generous terms which he offered in the name of Hanover were met by the traditional hard obscurantism of Rome. Never can Rome have more reasonable terms; the increasing tendency of modern times to face religious questions with tolerance and reason cannot offer anything more unprejudiced. This correspondence reveals Rome's besetting sin, and must stand at the head of all negotiations for modern attempts at Reunion, as a warning that, until Rome takes herself to task, the most liberal proposals of Protestantism will be flouted and rejected.

CHAPTER VII

THE REUNION OF PROTESTANTS

"Leibnitz's opinion of Catholicism took a more and more unfavourable turn."—PICHLER, II. 491, in reference to the opinion of Leibnitz after the Peace of Ryswick, 1697.

"Two periods are to be distinguished: the earlier legal and still immature and partly scholastic standpoint, and the later completely historical and organic point of view."—PICHLER, II. 6.

THE last letter to the Landgrave had been written in May 1693; the last to Pelisson a few months previously (Jan. 1693); neither letter contains an allusion to Reunion. It is clear from the tone of the letters immediately preceding them that Leibnitz had reached a stage of disillusionment. The last letter to Bossuet before the breach discusses philosophy and not Reunion (3 July 1694); the letters which lead up to it are those of a disappointed man. It is therefore certain that Leibnitz had lost hope in the practical success of the Spinola negotiations at some date round about July 1694. His vision of Reunion between Catholics and Protestants was growing dim.

It is true that his continued correspondence had brought out the distinguishing principles between Protestantism, even of the moderate University of Helmstadt, and Catholicism, but there is no doubt about the contribution made by the circumstances of the time to this result.

It is indeed surprising that the hopes for Reunion lasted so long, in the face of the official attitude of France to the Huguenots. The great hope which had been roused by the Gallican Decrees of 1682 (19 March), with their distinct modification of the principles of the Ultramontanes, was dashed to the ground by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, 1685 (17 Oct.). Good Catholics were astounded at this return to barbarism; the Landgrave was puzzled over "this exotic, not to say unchristian, procedure against

every rule of charity." [1] Leibnitz described his attitude in a long passage in his letter of 8 December 1686: he considers that the fifth article of the Revocation Edict is the hardest; "a friend," he writes, "could not console his dying friend with impunity, nor read to him any prayers, nor sing sacred hymns to him . . . and if we take this article in its extreme form, a Huguenot in France would not venture to read the Genevan Bible, nor sing Psalms, nor say prayers, morning nor evening . . . a father and a mother would not dare to instruct their children in the Catechism and in the principles of piety according to their religion"; [2] because all these religious practices were punishable with death.

A still more startling set-back to Reunion was to be found in Rome itself. In an unpublished letter of Aug. 1692 Leibnitz gives the results of his conversation with Cardinal Spinola [3] in Rome; nothing was to be expected from the Roman Curia; Popes Alexander VIII, Innocent XII and Clement XI were different men from Innocent XI. "The Roman Curia was entirely changed," wrote Leibnitz on 21 April 1690 from Venice to the Landgrave, "during my stay in Rome, by the death of the Pope and by the succession of a person of totally different principles. . . . It was curious to hear of German Protestants and French Huguenots taking the side of the Pope in Rome itself against monks and priests, and indeed against Jesuits, who were bound to the Pope by a special vow. . . . The present Pope . . . has had the sorrow of seeing something resembling a rebellion in Rome and the danger of an attack on his relatives, because of the fondness which he showed for them. . . . In short, we may say that the dead Pope was a success in great affairs and that he perhaps failed sometimes in small matters; but the present Pope is 'maximus in minimis.'" [4]

Political complications also interfered with the Reunion of the Churches. The henotic negotiations of the Emperor

[1] Rommel, II. 104.
[2] *Ibid.*, 93. We must admit that the more fanatical school of Protestants at Tübingen looked on the Revocation of the Edict with more ill-feeling than those of the school of Helmstadt.
[3] Pichler, II. 486. This Spinola is not the Bishop of Neustadt.
[4] Rommel, II. 204.

assumed more and more the nature of political subterfuge.[1] Spinola died in 1695, and when his successor, the Duke of Buchheim, attempted to interest the German Courts once more in the imperial irenics, he was completely rejected. The religious disguise of political motives was readily recognised. France too could not preserve the atmosphere which was necessary to any effective scheme for Reunion; Louis XIV's attack on the Grand Alliance almost drove Leibnitz to despair. "The chief enemy of national and ecclesiastical peace in Germany was, next to the Jesuits, the Policy of France, which always used religion as a pretext for predatory attacks on Germany."[2] Pichler has gone so far as to make the political aims of France the chief object of attack in such a purely religious work as the *Systema* of Leibnitz. He no doubt overstates this aspect of the situation; but he makes it very evident that the political motives of France were a serious menace and a growing hindrance to any scheme of Reunion.

Two staggering blows fell in 1697. The Elector of Saxony went over to Rome, and the Peace of Ryswick, with its notorious clause against the Protestants, irritated the whole non-Catholic world. The Jesuits rejoiced; Leibnitz grew more and more disgusted with Catholicism. "A great breach of the Peace of Westphalia had been perpetrated and Protestantism had been endangered."[3] "We must confess," he wrote to Ludolphi on 26 July 1698, "that the hope of Peace has been long deferred; it will not be the pleasure of our century to see it, and I doubt if it will be the pleasure of the century to come."[4]

All hope of Reunion between Rome and Augsburg perished in 1697. Further negotiations were carried on spasmodically until almost the last years of Leibnitz's life (until the Bull "Unigenitus," 8 Sept. 1713, when Ultramontanism triumphed completely). But all remaining prospects of long and fruitful efforts were destroyed by the outbreak of the Seven Years' War, 1701. When the Emperor Leopold died in 1705 there was no further en-

[1] Leibnitz felt that France encouraged religious division in Germany from political motives and that the Emperor was more Roman than German (Pichler, I. 110).

[2] Pichler, II. 481.

[3] *Ibid.*, 491, from an unpublished letter to Ulrich, 5 Nov. 1697.

[4] Dutens, IV. i. 157.

couragement from the imperial Court; Joseph I was too busy with other business. In his desperation Leibnitz thought of marriages and diplomacy. He hoped for a union between the new Emperor and the daughter of the Duke of Hanover, and later of another between Charles VI (successor to Joseph) and a Hanoverian Princess. He had placed great hope in the latter marriage; but Rome was intolerant, and compelled the Princess, who was only fourteen years of age, to renounce the religion of her parents and accept Communion under one kind. The Bull "Unigenitus" was final. "Never throughout the whole lifetime of Leibnitz were the prospects of Reunion between Catholics and Protestants more unfavourable than in the last years before his death." [1] Hopes were high for some time after 1680, but the evil spirit had gone out from Rome, only to bring back seven devils worse than himself. Clement dared to say that the Peace of Westphalia did more harm than the Thirty Years' War itself; and Leibnitz died in the conviction that the only chance of success was for a new Charlemagne to arise and put an end to the Papacy.

To these external influences on the religious activities of Leibnitz, it is necessary to add the evolution and development of his own religious thought. The greatest flaw in Guhrauer's Biography is the neglect of this important subject.[2] The Leibnitz of the correspondence with the Landgrave is a very different character from the Leibnitz of the last letters to Bossuet. Pichler deserves unlimited praise for his detailed treatment of this development. The greatness of Leibnitz is revealed in his readiness to change his mind under the compulsion of new knowledge.

The theological mind of Leibnitz is essentially that of a layman. It was natural that so great a scholar should rejoice in the fact that he was under no monetary obligation to serve a particular party, and that he was no pedant of one solitary subject. He came to theology enriched by the vast knowledge of the sciences, which he believed were rays of the same sun that enlightens and nourishes the truths of Christian doctrine. And for this cause he sang the praises of the lay theologians. "We have learned by

[1] Pichler, II. 501.

[2] And Foucher only turns to it in a short "Avertissement" to the *second* Edition of his 1st Volume.

experience," he writes to the Duke Anton Ulrich (17 Nov. 1698), "that as long as people who are only theologians were in charge of these matters (referring to religious irenics) we have been unable to progress one step forward." [1] He looked to France with envy, because there the battle had been fought almost entirely by laymen, like MM. Bignon, Harlay, de Thou, Pithou, du Puys, Rigaut, etc. "Laymen," he feels, "are less subject to prejudice than ecclesiastics, provided that they do not expect to win ecclesiastical honours for themselves or for their friends," [2] like M. de Marca, who rendered great service to the Church and State by his writings. When he became Archbishop of Paris he "put water into his wine and did all he could to please Rome." [3] The honest, scholarly layman was, in Leibnitz's view, the ideal theologian for those days of narrow religious prejudices.

Two qualifications, however, are required of laymen who undertake the serious study of theology. The first is sincerity of purpose and the second a competent knowledge of the subject. Leibnitz possessed both these qualifications. The first qualification has been dealt with above.[4] The second will bear investigation. The very first work, *De principio individui* (1663), testifies to the wide study of theology and especially of Church history which Leibnitz had made before his seventeenth year. "The most important of the older and more modern Scholastics, Thomists and Scotists, as well as Jesuits and Lutheran theologians, are cited from their own works." "This is still more copiously the case in his second treatise *De Arte combinatoria* (1666) and in the *Nova methodus discendæ docendæque jurisprudentiæ* of the same year, where he urges upon the Jurists a thorough knowledge of Church history, in order that they should not be led away by the usual fanaticism of the Confessions, and in which he specifies a literature so comprehensive that it was scarcely contained within the knowledge of the contemporary theologians." [5] He points out the need of a "history of irenics from the earliest schisms to our own times." In his early twenties he had read a considerable amount of religious literature in order to meet the attacks of the Socinians and Atheists. "His first letter to Arnauld, of

[1] Foucher, II. 207. [2] *Ibid.*, 208. [3] *Ibid.*
[4] P. 40 ff. [5] Pichler, I. 135.

the year 1671, gives us an insight into the religious zeal and inner conviction with which he entered at the age of twenty-four on his theological activity." [1] His later reading was so comprehensive that it would be difficult to name a writer, orthodox or unorthodox, ancient or contemporary, with whom he was not conversant. A list given by Leibnitz himself would terrify the most learned of our modern theologians; in it are found the names of Lullus, Valla, Pico, Wessel von Groningen, Tritheim, Vives, Steuchus, Mostellus, Naclant, Sarpi, Fabri, Thomas Bonartes, Thomas Anglus, Acontius, Taurellus, Episcopius, Jovis, Clauberg and other almost unknown writers.[2] But it must not be forgotten that by far the more important side of his great knowledge was gained by his correspondence with great theologians. An event or a problem would puzzle a thoughtful mind; recourse would be had to Leibnitz with his European fame for learning; after an ardent search for an answer he would sit down to incorporate his information in a letter. There must be thousands of such letters in the archives of Europe.

Wide and comprehensive reading, based on a sincere and burning motive, could only issue in one result. The theology of Leibnitz is ever in a state of flux. Foucher sees three periods. "Leibnitz," he says, "had three religious periods. In the first, that at Mainz, he experimented in Catholic proofs; . . . it is the apogee of his Catholic period. In the second period, at Hanover, Leibnitz withdraws more and more from Catholicism, and Bossuet, far from leading him back again, makes a great contribution towards cutting him off completely by his high bearing. In the third period . . . he becomes the precursor of Lessing and of Reimarus." [3] This division seems to be premature, however. When Foucher discusses the third period it amounts to nothing more than this: that Leibnitz, about the year 1700, had a controversy with Bossuet as to which books of the Old Testament were canonical and which not, and whether the Council of Trent had the power to declare the Apocryphal books canonical in contradiction to the early witness of the Church. "Lo! the Protestant spirit of Biblical criticism was born." "We can show it here as in germ; it was born of the question

[1] Pichler, I. 136. [2] *Ibid.*, 137, 138.
[3] Foucher, I. vii. (2nd edit.).

on the canonical books." [1] But surely this specific question was not raised for the first time by Leibnitz. And even if it was, are we justified in setting up a third period of his theological life on such slender grounds?

The view of Pichler is sounder. "Two periods are to be distinguished," he says in reference to the teaching of Leibnitz on the Church: "the earlier yet undeveloped and more legal, more or less scholastic standpoint, and the later period in which he views things from the point of view of true historical development." [2] The same development is obvious in his idea on the relations of Church and State. "The double person of the Middle Ages and of the modern times, which dwelt in Leibnitz, is again revealed in his opinions on the relation of the Church to the State. . . . While he, on the one hand, fiercely combats the political teaching of Puffendorff, on the other hand he, now and then, sets up principles which go beyond Puffendorff, and only find their consequences in Montesquieu and indeed in Rousseau himself." [3]

The study of history was the chief cause of this curious development. More and more history becomes his favourite pursuit. "The historical works of Leibnitz are the ripe fruit of a long and busy life." [4] "I found as age and strength increased an extraordinary pleasure in reading history," [5] he confesses. Just before his death, on 14 Nov. 1716, he expressed a wish that he might bring his *Annales* down to 1198, but his pen fell from his busy hand at the year 1005. The archives and libraries of the House of Brunswick as well as those of the neighbouring monasteries were at his command. The journeys which he made in search of documents are among the most amazing in the history of historical research. Between the years 1687 and 1690 he travelled through the south of Germany via Marburg, Rheinfels, Frankfort, Sulzbach, and on to Vienna in quest of material. From Venice he started for Rome and Naples and returned by way of Florence and Modena.

A terse sentence of Pichler sums up the influence of history upon his religious views. "Leibnitz the philosopher of history holds entirely different opinions from Leibnitz the

[1] Foucher, I. lxxv.
[2] Pichler, II. 6. [Chapter Heading.]
[3] *Ibid.*, 115.
[4] Rommel, I. 187.
[5] Guhrauer, I. 10.

jurist, the mathematician and the dialectician." [1] The reason is not far to seek. He had discovered that no sound theology could neglect a thorough knowledge of history. As the fourth and fifth conditions of a reformed theology he gives " the study of history and a completely impartial treatment of the same." [2] He found his contemporaries almost entirely ignorant of such study. The decline of the study of history he dates back to the time when the domination of Rome destroyed all national life. The thirteenth century was to him one of darkness. Good historians disappeared in that century, and darkness was increased by the mendicants. The study of history therefore caused him to revise his theological point of view on many subjects which will be discussed in the following pages.

There were other conditions which influenced this development. Leibnitz always knew the difference between the actual and the ideal. Like a wise statesman he was willing to go a very long way to meet his opponent.[3] His life was spent in building bridges and in seeing them fall just after he had managed to escape to some place of safety. " Until the conclusion of the Peace of Ryswick and the defection of the Electoral House of Saxony Leibnitz built the bridge almost entirely from the Catholic side "; [4] when this bridge fell he commenced " to build a bridge on which Protestants could meet." As long as the essentials or what he regarded as the essentials of Christianity were preserved he would go a long way in accepting the unessential adjuncts of the prevailing party in the Church. Concessions must be made on a large scale to the party which held political supremacy, but these concessions must always be reconcilable with Christian essentials. " As long as the Catholic States in Europe and in Germany had the political ascendancy, a politic theologian like Leibnitz could do nothing but strive to picture Catholicism to the Protestant party in as beautiful colours as possible." When actual historic facts made it

[1] Pichler, II. 5.

[2] *Ibid.*, I. 155. N.B. The growing researches of Leibnitz into history are evident from his later letters to Bossuet and from the *Annales* of his last years, which he left incomplete.

[3] Trevoux in his *Mémoires*, August 1721, p. 1364, says: " The conciliatory spirit of Leibnitz was certainly dangerous to his reputation for sincerity of purpose."

[4] Pichler, II. 503.

no longer possible to hope for anything from the Catholic party, he turned away to the much more circumscribed task of uniting the divided parties of the Protestant school.[1]

It is essential to realise the change which had come over Leibnitz on definite subjects of Church organisation, faith or worship.

His conception of the Church in the earlier period is almost that of the great Boineburg, . . . the Gallican conception as held at Mainz. A few extracts from the *Systema* and kindred works are sufficient to illustrate this (see above, p. 90 ff.). An unpublished work of 1688–1672 confirms these extracts. "The most essential mark of the true Church is the unity of the Hierarchy, . . . the State is one though the times change. The unity of the Hierarchy consists in the succession of those who rule." [2] In spite of his "Catholicism," however, Leibnitz was as far removed from Ultramontanism as Melancthon, Luther, Calixtus or Spener, and in his most extreme statements he never accepts the Council of Trent nor its unfortunate anathemas. The later letters to Bossuet illustrate his later attitude. He came to regard the Church as a much wider society. "The Catholic Church," he writes, "preserves the Catholic Faith, and is formed by the universal communion of the saints; he who secedes from this communion is a schismatic." [3] The mere circumstance that a

[1] It would be difficult to fix a precise date for the change in the outlook of Leibnitz. It was, of course, a gradual process. He confessed that "under the influence of his mathematical and legal studies . . . he did homage to the traditional view of life and the world until the middle of his fortieth year." John Wycliffe passed through a similar general transition. The Great Schism of the West was the external influence and his own vigorous intellect the inner force. He began as a metaphysical writer in the language of the schools (De Universalibus, De Materia et Forma, etc.), or as a champion of national rights (Determinatio quædam de dominio 1366) with an orthodox attitude to religion. He ended with his *Opus Evangelicum*, of which the 3rd book is known to scholars as *De Antichristo*, with an attack on the whole system of the Papacy.

N.B. We have already seen evidence of this evolution in the correspondence. The idea of the "Inner Communion" in the letters to the Landgrave; the conception of "material" as distinct from "formal" heresy; of fundamentals in relation to tolerable doctrines in the correspondence with Pelisson, and the open confession of love towards God as the central doctrine of his creed to Pelisson and Bossuet, with the development of the critical spirit towards Trent and the Canon, are signs of this process.

[2] De bono unitatis et malis schismatis . . . (still unpublished, but given in Pichler, II. 11).

[3] De Fide et ecclesia . . . (again only in Pichler, I. 18). See further Pichler, II. i. 37.

Church is not bound up with Rome and the Papacy does not disqualify it from the right to be called Catholic. Rome exhibits the sect spirit when she refuses this right to the Eastern Churches and to the Protestants. True Catholics are they who are trying to restore the full unity of the Church. At the same time, the Protestant Antichrist theory of Rome is false and puerile. The Book of Revelation has a distinct historical setting; Pagan Rome and not ecclesiastical Rome is Antichrist. While Leibnitz had clearly discarded his earlier view of the Church, he cannot be said to have reached any definite idea in his later period. He is dissatisfied with the divisive theories of Protestantism, and his doctrine of the "invisible Church" is far removed from the elective ideas of Calvin and Geneva. He was no doubt on the way to a fuller and truer conception of the Church. Meanwhile, however, he prays that the Churches will tolerate each other and that no one will think evil of those who pass from party to party at the summons of conscience and sincere thought. "The one rule of Faith is only to believe what is proved. And the members of the Roman Church have strayed from this rule more than all other Christians." [1] It is better to be sincere and wrong than to trust blindly. If sects arise, as they are bound to do where freedom is allowed, they will not endanger truth, and love must rule the treatment of such heretics.

With the change of view on the Church came a new conception of the Hierarchy, Episcopacy and the Papacy.[2] As long as Leibnitz held the juristic view of his earlier works he thought that the whole Roman Hierarchy might possibly be considered as of divine right, though never in the exaggerated Roman form. Even in the *Systema* he accepts the Hierarchy as the representative of the whole body rather than as the extension of the Papacy. But he could not remain here. His restless soul was surveying the convictions of other Churches; and his passion for righteousness made him question the divine origin of a Hierarchy which had so often produced poor fruit. History revealed to him the sins of the Popes, and above all the bitter unchristian attitude of the Roman Church to those outside her boundary. He noted too the courage and the conviction of Protestant-

[1] Pichler, II. 58, quoted from Foucher, I. 77 (1st edit.).
[2] *Ibid.*, 65 ff.

ism; so that "he could not long continue his early attitude of treating the Roman Hierarchy as of possibly divine origin." [1]

On the question of Episcopacy, Leibnitz definitely expresses a belief in its divine origin in his earlier works. But after 1700 there is no reference to such an idea except to contradict it. His historical studies and his own experience had caused the change.[2] The French bishops had shown signs of restoring the purity of the Early Church; but had disappointed the best Protestants by servility to the King. "Most of them," he wrote to the Landgrave on 27 April, 1683, "do nothing but flatter the Court, and we live no longer in a time when strong bishops preferred to lose their lives rather than to neglect their duty." [3] The German bishops were powerless in the presence of the Jesuits. To this experience he added his own researches into history. In his *Annales* he expresses a doubt as to whether the bishop differed from the presbyter in the Early Church; but as the number of Christians increased and some system of administration was needed the bishop took over the work of the Apostles; "then the bishops of a province recognised the bishop of the metropolis as their chief on the basis of the political organisation, and the bishops . . . were elected by popular vote." [4] Episcopacy was therefore a valuable product of history, but not the divine system of Church government. Leibnitz could not bring himself in his later phase to see its origin in the New Testament; it was a useful institution of the Early Church. But he was throughout an Episcopalian. He urged the King of Prussia to establish Episcopacy on twelve grounds: first and foremost because of its age and universality; there was no King without it; Sweden, Denmark and England, and the English saying, 'No Bishop, no King,' were offered as evidence; there had been bishops in Prussia after the Reformation as well as before it; Merlin, Bishop of Samland, was an example among others; the establishment of a bishop's seat had always been regarded as a great event; the expenses of restoring Episcopacy would not be heavy, since there were many Italian and Greek bishops with

[1] Pichler, II. 66.
[2] *Ibid.*, 77.
[3] Rommel, I. 320.
[4] Pichler, II. 80.

incomes less than some German theologians; the Crown would not suffer, but would rather find new support from Episcopacy; Protestantism would take a weapon from the hands of Catholicism, which put the cause of disunion among Protestants down to a lack of episcopal government; princes and men of rank would then consecrate themselves to the ministry like Prince George of Anhalt; and though this argument may sound materialistic and worldly it is justified by the fact that such men are necessary for an equitable discussion of matters which concern both Catholics and Protestants; if one side has all the learned bishops and men of rank, "in Colloquiis" and "in Synodis," there must of necessity be a one-sided result.

But, above all, Episcopacy was an essential condition of Reunion. Could a small nation hope for a share in Reunion if it stood outside the universal episcopal order? The Reformers themselves had accepted it as the order of the Church, although they had not supported it as of divine right. Even heretics were favourable to the system; and Germany is blamed by almost the whole Church, Latin, Greek, Armenian, and all the other Churches for this breach in the "linea ordinationis." It is the duty of Prussia to restore it, in preparation for the day when God will restore unity to His Church.

The elevation of the House of Hanover and the willingness of the Czar, Peter the Great, to discuss Reunion, only strengthened this conviction in Leibnitz. But he retained his belief that the institution was of human ordering, and went so far as to state, "it is not absolutely necessary that a bishop be ordained by other bishops, though it is better that ordination should take place in this way, because the ancient Church . . . which followed close on the Apostles, seems to have introduced Episcopacy." [1] It is clear that Leibnitz, in his later days, had more sympathy with the Oriental idea of Episcopacy than with the Roman, with its conception of Episcopacy as the extension of Papal power.

The fight between the jurist and the historian within the soul of Leibnitz was most decisive over the nature of the Papacy. He made a careful comparison of Papal and non-Papal countries from the point of view of religion,

[1] Pichler, II. 88.

science and nationality. And he came to the conclusion that progress depended on a breach with the Papacy in its then accepted form. In his youth he was enamoured of Dante's idea of a co-partnership between Emperor and Pope. But he modified it to a large extent. He looked on the Papacy as an honourable and noble institution which deserved the support of Christianity. His words about the Petrine origin in the *Systema* are very strong, but as Pichler remarks they cannot imply the divine origin of the Papacy without bringing Leibnitz under the charge of dishonesty.[1] He leaves a loophole by promising to return to the subject later. "Never did he appear so favourable," however, "to the possibility or probability of the Divine institution of the Primacy than in the years 1683–1688," when the Gallican limitations were in operation against the Pope. To the Landgrave he went so far as to show its possibility, though not on historical grounds.[2] He also made the bold statement that "he saw no hindrance to the submission of all dioceses to the Bishop of Rome, in the same way as suffragans (ordinary bishops) are subject to the Metropolitan."[3] There is not the slightest doubt that Leibnitz looked for a universal and modified papal system based on utility rather than on divine right and to which the French Church had taken the first step. This vision remained with him to the end. He was convinced that the time would come when a purified Papacy would respect the aspirations of the peoples and when its aim would be to serve and not to domineer. "Perhaps," he wrote in 1674, "it would be conducive to the public good if there existed a kind of universal State, called the Church, in which there resided a certain supreme jurisdiction over all Christians, by whose authority wars were prevented between Catholics, and princes themselves were kept to their duty and Crusades arranged against the heathen."[4] Once only had the possibility of such a Papacy stood at the doors. It was at the Council of Constance. "I believe," he writes, "that if there had been popes renowned for wisdom and goodness, who would have been willing to follow the rules arranged at Constance, they would have remedied abuses, prevented the breach and strengthened or even

[1] Pichler, II. 96.
[2] *Ibid.*, 102. See above, p. 107 f.
[3] *Ibid.*, 103.
[4] Klopp, III. 168.

improved the Christian community." [1] Meanwhile the realisation of the vision tarried.

The final view of the Papacy is given in the *Annales*. Rome must yield all her claims to divine right, and disavow all her Canon Law and Bulls and Constitutions which claim for her the position of the one Divine Church; since the Papacy is rooted in a very natural soil. In an untranslatable passage Leibnitz states the result of his studies: "Romani pontifices, jam olim erecti splendore primariæ Urbis, unde in omnia regimen, cuncta ecclesiæ munia in se traxere." The Papacy grew out of the Empire. And "the bishops are not subject to the Pope by divine right, but are to be regarded as comrades; he shall call them brethren." [2]

The development of Leibnitz may be studied in one final question, that of Transubstantiation. We possess his views over a period of fifty years (1667–1716).[3] In a letter to Arnauld of 1671 he says that he has spent four years trying to find satisfactory principles on which to base the mystery; he emphasised motion and not extension as the essence of a body, and expressed his belief that there was no real difference between Transubstantiation and the doctrine of the Real Presence. He takes up a similar position in the unpublished "Demonstratio possibilitatis mysteriorum eucharistiæ." He confesses his adherence to the Augsburg Confession, but rejoices in his discovery that "Transubstantiation and the Real Presence are in their inmost and ultimate analysis contained in each other," [4] and that all disputes on this matter are due to misunderstanding. The *Systema* continues this thought (see above, p. 85 f.).

The *Annales* reveal the different attitude which Leibnitz took to this question when he lifted it from the realm of philosophy to that of history. "We must confess," he says, "that the ancients did not express themselves on this mystery as they who treasure dogma are wont to do." [5] The struggles of the ninth and tenth centuries "gave birth at last to the dogma of Transubstantiation which the

[1] Dutens, V. 58.
[2] Pichler, II. 111.
[3] *Ibid.*, 342 ff.
[4] *Ibid.*, 346.
[5] *Ibid.*, 355, quotes the *Annales*, p. 794.

Scholastics recognised in spite of its novelty" [1] (Pichler's trans., lit. the novelty of which the scholastic doctors realised). The philosophic trend of the religion of the scholastics was largely responsible for this, but "they were also carried beyond the meaning of the Lord's words and the tradition of antiquity by the unfortunate circumstances of their day." [2] He speaks of Transubstantiation in future as "your Transubstantiation," [3] because it had lost complete hold over his thought.

In this final stage, however, he did not make the doctrine of Transubstantiation a hindrance to Reunion. He felt that it enshrined a much neglected truth. "He held that the faith in the Real Presence was so essential that he considered those who, like the Zwinglians, did not accept it were not real members of the Church, and desired only that toleration be granted them." [4] The reception of a mere symbol was to him the open door of Socinianism and the rejection of all mystery. He retained this attitude to the end, and preached to his generation the necessity of union round the essential doctrine of the Eucharist. They were to cast away unessentials and believe in the early New Testament doctrine of the Real Presence without further definition.

Pichler has traced similar changes in the thought of Leibnitz on his attitude to Church and State, to Schism and kindred subjects; but enough has been said to introduce the final activity of his religious efforts—the attempt to unite Lutherans and Calvinists and indeed all Protestants.

The plans for Reunion between Protestants and Catholics had failed, and Leibnitz himself was almost another person when he turned to his scheme for the Reunion of the Protestants themselves. On 25 Nov. 1697 he wrote to Cuneau, Secretary of State for Brandenburg: "If this terrible breach into the Peace of Westphalia (referring to the Peace of Ryswick) may serve to arouse and to unite the Protestant powers . . . we might be comforted by it." Henceforward his chief efforts after peace were to be directed towards the Reunion of the Churches of Germany, Holland, England and Russia; Rome had disappointed him. But his chances of success or indeed of an interesting exchange

[1] Pichler, II. 356. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*, 357. [4] *Ibid.*, 355.

of opinions were decidedly small. He was "suspect" among the mass of Protestants because of his previous views; no great Protestant, like Spener, for instance, entered into correspondence with him in the same spirit or for the same length of time as the Landgrave or Bossuet.[1] And Leibnitz himself was losing his early vigour. He had corresponded with the Landgrave and Pelisson until death had carried them off; and he was still engaged on the correspondence with Bossuet until Bossuet himself was too ill and aged to go further, dying two years after the correspondence ceased. And now it was the bronze age for Leibnitz himself. He could not expect great things.

Protestantism was in its most irritated condition. Stung by its failure to hold the ground which it had won at the Peace of Westphalia, and stupidly divided within itself on questions of belief, it was proof against all attempts at unity. As early as 1631, in the midst of the Thirty Years' War, when danger from without drove Protestants together for mutual protection, a Conference was arranged between Doctors of Saxony and Brandenburg at Leipzig. Matthias Hoe (of Hohenegg), Polycarp Lyser and Henry Hofner took the side of Saxony and the Lutherans; John Bergius, Court Preacher at Berlin, John Crocius, Professor at Marburg and Theophilus Neuberger, Superintendent at Cassel, took the side of Berlin and of the Reformed Church. The landing of Gustavus Adolphus at Stralsund in 1630 gave some hope of peace, and for a time the meetings were conducted with great moderation, the Reformed consenting to subscribe to many articles of the Augsburg Confession; "but the Lutherans were not to be induced to make concessions, and things remained as they were after a twenty days' discussion."[2] When the question was discussed at Thorn in the territory of the Elector of Brandenburg himself in August 1645, the thirty-seven Lutheran theologians ruined all chances of Reunion by their stubbornness. The fifteen Reformed theologians had accidentally arrived first on the scene and had taken the best places, to the irritation of the Lutherans. And although the Calvinists gave way, the Lutherans would not cease from petty strife. The President was a Catholic. He opened each session with

[1] The correspondence with Fabricius is the longest.
[2] Hagenbach, p. 147.

prayer;[1] the Calvinists thought his words so appropriate that they were inclined to join in the general prayer, but the Lutherans had their own prayer in an adjoining room, to the disgust of the Conference. Such bickering put off the discussion of the further question of Reunion between Protestantism as a whole with Catholicism for almost a month, and embittered rather than conciliated the Catholic party. The chief end for which Ladislas had called the Conference was therefore out of the question. When William IV of Hesse attempted the Reunion of Lutherans and Calvinists again at a friendly Conference in Cassel (summer, 1661) the same distrust was revealed. The Lutheran theologians of Rintheln (Peter Musæus and John Henichius) met the Calvinists of Marburg (Sebastian Curtius and John Hemius), as 132 years before Luther, Dekolampad, Melanchthon and Zwingli had met under the auspices of Philip of Hesse. During 132 years the parties had come no closer to each other but were, if anything, more divided.[2]

Leibnitz was aware of the perilous nature of his new enterprise. He told the Bishop of London that the Lutherans had many members who belonged to the "genus irritabile vatum";[3] and although he expected great success in Hanover, Brandenburg and England, he was conscious that the Dutch theologians were dangerously extreme in their Protestantism. They were a danger to his external scheme of a European Protestant Reunion. But he held firmly to the belief of the best Protestant theologians like Conring, Puffendorff and Thomasius, that the differences between Lutherans and Calvinists were not fundamental. He wrote widely on the great dividing controversy of predestination and urged all men to work "to destroy the silly phantom which divides the two Protestant parties."[4]

Some misunderstanding has been shown about the spirit in which he attempted his schemes (1699–1706). Merz is of the opinion that Leibnitz "advocated mutual tolerance and united action against the common enemy";[5] Pro-

[1] Hagenbach, p. 152.

[2] William Penn wrote from London to the Magistrate at Emden: "You attack the Roman claim to infallibility, but make yourselves guilty of the same or even a worse presumption" (Pichler, II. 504).

[3] *Ibid.*, 508.

[4] *Ibid.*, 504, 505, in a letter to Cuneau, 4 July 1697.

[5] Merz, p. 123.

testant Reunion, according to this view, was nothing less than the coalescence of the two divisions of the Protestant Army against the united forces of Rome. But all the evidence is against this view. Leibnitz was clear that the Emperor and all right-minded Catholics would welcome his schemes. "The Emperor and all really earnest and well-meaning Roman Catholics like His Majesty," he wrote to a Minister of Hanover in 1698, "far from being able to find anything to criticise in this project of the Church of the Reformation, could not fail to be delighted with it; the Protestants would advance to meet them with ideas of a universal Church and would remove (lit. it—the project—would approach and remove, etc.) one of the greatest difficulties, which still estranges them from Roman Catholics." [1] The plans of Leibnitz were a new departure; "his intention was not, as many other Protestant theologians before him, to unite the divided Protestants against the Catholics . . . but to build a bridge over the chasm, which till then had separated them, so that they could meet each other there." [2]

There is more truth in the political bias of these later schemes.[3] All were directed against France; but it was France as a religious and not as a national force. France stood for the ill-intentioned Catholics, the hammerers of Protestantism and the lovers of the Ryswick clause. If it was necessary to unite Protestantism for a better understanding with the best-intentioned members of the Catholic Church, it was even more necessary to use Protestant Reunion for the suppression of those who were determined to cripple Protestantism altogether. France was on the way "for doing more damage to the Protestants than the House of Austria had ever been able to do." [4] "The power of France and the success and hatred of the papal party

[1] Quoted Pichler, II. 506. [2] *Ibid.*, 503.

[3] But it would be unfair to quote a passage like that to Fabricius (15 Oct. 1708: "Our sole right to the British Crown rests upon the exclusion and detestation of the Roman religion, and therefore we must avoid everything that savours of lukewarmness on the subject of Popery") at the expense of the general and dominant tendency of his attitude. A man must be judged by his tendency and not by solitary expressions like this. The whole question of the English Crown has been wrongly estimated by Roman scholars like Russell, and the charges of "political servility" are unjust, when the whole attitude of Leibnitz is considered.

[4] Pichler, II. 505, quotes Klopp, V. 257, 265.

threaten us with a dangerous revolution if we do not make a careful and vigorous opposition," [1] he said. And if Austria and Spain joined France there could be nothing to expect but the total destruction of Protestantism.

While therefore Leibnitz did not assume a militant attitude to Catholicism in his new projects, he was cognisant of the dangers, which threatened from the side of France, and to this extent his aim takes a political colour. But, beneath all lesser motives, he works " with the same conscientious intention, the same regard for the furtherance of true religion and united co-operation for the national good," [2] as he had previously shown in his plans for Reunion between Catholics and Protestants. The same earnest desire for Reunion as an end in itself is manifest in the general tone of his efforts as it is earlier so abundantly illustrated in his letters to Bossuet, the Landgrave, and to Pelisson.

Brunswick and Brandenburg were to be the centres of Reunion activities; the former stood for Lutheranism, the latter for Calvinism; both had risen to the chief positions among the Protestant States since the secession of the Elector of Saxony and the Count Palatine. In 1684 the tie between them had been strengthened by the marriage of the Crown Prince of Brandenburg to the Princess Sophia Charlotte of Hanover. But the greatest fact was that both States represented the high-water mark of religious toleration in the century.

Sufficient attention has been given to the religion of the Hanoverian Court and the theologians of Helmstadt; the religious atmosphere of Brandenburg and Berlin was tolerant in a different sense. Though not willing to go as far as the House of Brunswick in its negotiations with Rome, it followed the spirit of the Great Elector, Frederick William (1640–1688), in his desire to look on Protestantism as one whole. The common cause for which Gustavus Adolphus, the great-uncle of the Elector, had fought and died had impressed the boy of thirteen years. He " bore Protestantism as a whole in his heart " [3] from that moment. In July 1653 he had eased the minds of the Lutherans by proclaiming that they could remain loyal to the Confession of Augsburg without fear of compulsion. His attitude

[1] Pichler, II. 506. [2] *Ibid.*, 503. [3] Hagenbach, p. 156.

to the Huguenots and even to Catholics and Socinians has already been noted (p.14 f.). When the Lutheran preacher Fabricius (of the Nicholai Church, Stettin) used offensive expressions against the lukewarmness of his lord he received the nominal punishment of one and a half years' imprisonment; any other prince would have had him executed for his pains. The time came, however, when measures became necessary to restrain bitter religious passion. Johann Henzelmann (Rector of the Berlin Gymnasium) said from the pulpit of the Grey Abbey Church: "We condemn the Catholics, the Calvinists and also the Helmstadtians; in short, he who is not a Lutheran is cursed. I know that I say this at the risk of my life, but I am the servant of Christ." [1] Bitter words were said by Lutherans and Calvinists, and it became necessary for the Elector to find conciliatory measures. He published a sermon by his Court preacher Stosch and had it distributed among the people, but without success. On 2 Jan. 1662 and again on 16 Sept. 1664 he issued an Edict forbidding the reciprocal use of offensive nicknames (aller anzüglichen Beinamen) and the mutual recriminations which had been so common. Each preacher was to sign a declaration to this effect; the refusal to sign being punishable by dismissal from office. There were other severe penalties. Many strong Lutherans were dismissed, and Saxony, with its fanatical school at Wittenberg, became a popular rendezvous for them. Later it became necessary to forbid students leaving the country for their education at Wittenberg.

Frederick, who later (1688–1713) became the first King of Prussia, followed the example of his illustrious predecessor. He was ably seconded in this direction by "the influence of his second wife, the witty Charlotte of Hanover, who had been educated in three creeds, so as to fit her for any husband." [2] Philosophers, artists, Jesuits and Pietists were to be found in the palace at Lietzenburg. "Among the latter were Spener, Franke and Thomasius—all of them men who, for their freedom of speech, had been persecuted in other German States, but at Frederick's Court had found favour and an opportunity to teach in his new University." [3] There was a certain amount of political animosity towards

[1] Hagenbach, p. 157. [2] Henderson, II. 40.
[3] *Ibid.*, 41, 42.

Rome and the Emperor, however, owing to Frederick's "grand project" for the crown of Prussia.

The outline of his plans was confided by Leibnitz to Cuneau the private secretary of the Elector and a mathematician with whom he was fond of conversing. Dankelmann the Lord President (Ober-Präsident) was to be drawn into the scheme. Leibnitz's letter to Cuneau of 7 Oct. 1697 contains a summary of his proposals.[1] "The matter," he writes, "is more necessary than ever and also more practicable than ever," but "est aliquid prodire tenus, si non datur ultra." Three steps are necessary to a right understanding between the Protestant parties. "The first step is purely civil; it consists of the genuine unity and sincere help" on the part of both Lutherans and Calvinists. "Your powerful master," he continues, "is the first Protestant of the Kingdom, after the breach made by the House of Saxony; that is if the parties are not sundered one from the other; consequently he is the director of their affairs." The union of Lutherans and Calvinists under the House of Brandenburg is fundamental for a sincere agreement among Protestants, and this first step may bring much fruit; so much so that England and Holland will be prepared to support it.

The second step aims at an ecclesiastical union, and its purport is that people do not condemn each other on religious grounds. The "tolerantia ecclesiastica" must be exercised. Leibnitz holds up the University of Helmstadt as an example. "The theological faculty of Helmstadt," he says, "is wholly inclined this way. . . . I have always tried to prevent the appointment of professors of the Wittenberg party . . . and I have recommended to Princes and their Ministers the support of the school and the attitude of the incomparable Calixtus who has brought so much honour to Germany and to Protestantism." Leibnitz had already summoned Johann Fabricius from Altdorf, who was expected to arrive any day, and Dr. Johann Andreas Schmidt from Jena, who had just arrived. One was a

[1] The letter is given by Guhrauer, II. 165 ff. Cuneau was born in 1661 at Cassel, and died in Berlin in 1715 as "Aufseher des geheimen Archivs und Mitglied der Societät der Wissenschaften." The letters to Cuneau are found in the *Berlinischen Bibliothek*, I. 174, pts. 1–6, edited by J. K. K. Oerlich.

scholar of Musæus at Jena; the other a member of the Helmstadt School.

The third step was the most difficult. It may be possible to make members of both Communions accept a civil and ecclesiastical unity, but difficulties arise over the discovery of the way to a theological unity—a unity in belief. It is certain that unity on the meaning of the Lord's Supper would be difficult because there were so many varied opinions about it; then there was the question of predestination. "I do not see, however," writes Leibnitz, "that this unity in doctrine or opinion is necessary. We do well to attain it as far as possible, but we shall not depend on it as long as this variety of opinion does not endanger the unity that we desire." Leibnitz himself was convinced that the third step might be taken; beneath the divisions over the Eucharist and predestination he was convinced that he had found the reconciling truths. "The controversy on predestination," he says, "proceeds from misunderstanding and I have convinced many clever men on it." [1] But he knew that it would be difficult to convince the two parties to make an ecclesiastical union, let alone a union on grounds of belief.

[1] The *Théodicée* had this in view. It "must not be regarded so much as a philosophical but as a theological work." Already, in 1671, Boineburg had sent an anonymous Latin essay on the Problem of Free Will and Predestination to the theologians of all the Confessions in Germany. This essay was the work of Leibnitz. It demonstrates his interest in one of the most burning problems of the day, which was also one of the vital hindrances to Reunion. He used the expression "Théodicée" for the first time in a letter to Magliabechi (1697), and expressed the hope that the strife on questions of Free Will, Divine Providence, etc., may be allayed. As the Reunion efforts of the Protestants failed in Conference, the more he turned to his written work. The necessary encouragement, which he needed in his busy life for writing the book, came from the Queen, Sophia Charlotte, his scholar in philosophy. The greater part of the book is due to the reading of Bayle's works in the Castle of Lützenburg, where he and the Queen read and argued incessantly. Bayle was a Frenchman by birth and a Calvinist by religion, who had been banished from his native land and passed his time in Holland as a private scholar. His Voltairian spirit appealed to the critical queen, who induced Leibnitz to produce his *Essais de Théodicée sur la bonté de Dieu, la liberté de l'homme et l'origine du mal* (1710), though she herself died Feb. 1705. It was translated into Latin by the Jesuit Bosse, but it is difficult to be interested in a work which has lost point in our times. It is sufficient to notice that Leibnitz knew the critical relationship between the problem of free will and the Reunion of the Churches. And no one can fail to be moved by the excellent development of his argument to the conclusion in the Parable of Sextus, son of Tarquinius Superbus (see Merz, p. 168 ff.), for an illustration of the doctrine of the best of possible worlds.

Nevertheless his final opinion seems to have been in favour of toiling up to the third step; he realised how unsafe were all movements without definite basal principles, and he was not content until he had both feet firmly planted on the top step of his ladder. This is clear from an interesting document (De Unione Protestantium Molani et Leibnitii Judicium) [1] preserved by Dutens, and translated from the German original. "However good and Christian, however praiseworthy and useful," it begins in criticism of the second step in the Reunion programme, "mutual toleration or virtual union among Evangelicals may appear in theory, it has always produced such pernicious effects in practice . . . that the most moderate of those among the Evangelicals, who do not recognise the special doctrines of the Calvinists as fundamental but who look on those who believe such things as brothers in Christ, rightly abhor a tolerance . . . which has always made the condition of the Evangelicals worse by persecution and secret oppression, etc." [2] The Conference at Cassel is instanced as a special example of the wrongs (des torts) due to reciprocal toleration. No conference since the Reformation proceeded with more candour or sincerity; both sides had men of real scholarship, and everyone expected great results. But what happened? Lutherans suffered bitterly. Instead of mutual toleration Calvinism assumed a militant attitude and rejoiced in it. The University of Rintheln, a Lutheran establishment, had to suffer unfair pressure. "Not only was the free exercise of Calvinism, a matter just in itself, introduced there, but the Academy was further compelled to yield its church to the Calvinists—the church in which, till that time, the students in theology had trained as preachers; more than this, and in spite of the terms of Peace . . . the Lutheran theologians . . . have not been able to prevent the arrival of several professors of the Reformed Faith in their midst for the purpose of teaching philosophy, and, among others, one for ethics and logic, two sciences which exert an only too-powerful influence over theology." [3] Two Reformed preachers have been made professors, one of Greek and the other of Hebrew, with an unlimited power of giving a philological exposition of the Old and New Testament. The Lutheran Magistrate and Council have

[1] Dutens, I. 735 ff. [2] *Ibid.* [3] Dutens.

been displaced by a Calvinist Burgomaster and Councillors. Calvinism went so far as to attack Lutheran dogmas. "The result of all this is that Mr. Musæus has left Rintheln, and has gone to reside at Helmstadt; Mr. Henichius, when he saw that his good intentions met with failure, was overcome with such terrible grief that he died a short time after; the third theologian, Mr. Eccard, who defended the Cassel Conference in his public writings against several of our authors, and who on this account drew upon himself universal hate, abandoned the Chair of Theology, when he could remain no longer at Rintheln, a Chair which he had held for so many years, and has gone over to Hildesheim to be Superintendent and Almoner of the Chapter." [1]

On the futility of mere toleration the Elector of Brandenburg was agreed. When he became aware of the proposals of Leibnitz he was keen about taking the third step.[2] A letter of Ursinus, later Bishop of Bar, details this desire. "His Royal Majesty," he writes, "is quite agreed that we should work for such a union and not for so-called tolerance—a union by which the unholy Schism might be terminated, and by which one party and the other may be able and willing to use with a clear conscience the worship and Communion of the whole. His Royal Majesty therefore thinks that it is necessary also to abolish the party names, Lutheran and Reformed, and henceforth to call both Churches by the single term Evangelical." [3] It was surprising that the Elector should take this view, as Calvinism had always gained the advantage when the Churches had agreed on the second step of mere toleration. And his subjects were not at all satisfied about his policy. A pamphlet war went on for two years as to the wisdom of taking the third step.

Leibnitz did not write a *Systema* for the solution of the problem. He tried other means. In the first place, he was convinced that secrecy was more imperative now than it had been in his negotiations with the Roman Church, and, in the second place, precedent was sufficient. He would enter into the labours of the great Calixtus, to whom the solution of the problem had been a life work. When Fabricius and Schmidt were securely established at Helmstadt he made a journey there to solicit their interest in the

[1] Dutens. [2] Guhrauer, *in loco*. [3] *Ibid.*, II. 168.

Reunion schemes, and at the same time persuaded Professor Calixtus the younger to edit a number of his father's irenical works, and especially the *De Tolerantia reformatorum ecclesiastica*. This would secure publicity for the second step at least, as the contention of the *De Tolerantia* was that the present division of opinion should not stand in the way of fraternisation. The newly appointed professors were openly to assent to this teaching; the younger Calixtus was to write an introduction to his father's work; all the Colleges were to subjoin eulogies; the mouths of the opposition were to be closed, and the second step was to be made a matter of practical policy. Furthermore, the plans became known in Berlin. Leibnitz turned to Ezekiel von Spanheim, Privy Councillor (geheimer Rath), scholar and statesman of the Brandenburg Court, who enjoyed the special confidence of the Elector. Spanheim had contributed to the success of Leibnitz's *Codex Juris Diplomaticus* from the Brandenburg archives: a debt which is expressed in the preface to Mantissa (1700). Leibnitz had again to thank him for his courtesy. Just as he was setting out to the French Court as ambassador, and after taking the advice of Dankelmann, he placed the proposals of Leibnitz before the Elector. The matter was then in the centre of the most tolerant tradition of religious thought. Frederick III was not long in bestirring himself to active interest. Leibnitz wrote to Fabricius 20 Sept. 1698: "His Serene Highness, the Elector of Brandenburg, is undertaking the promotion of Peace negotiations and we hope for great results, which I will not pause to enumerate." [1]

The general course of events has been summarised for us in a letter of Leibnitz [2] to the Princess of Wales (apparently about 1716). He introduces his scheme for the wider Reunion of the Protestants (see later, p. 207 f.) by recounting the circumstances which have led up to it, and, in particular, the work of the Elector of Brandenburg. "When the late Counsellor von Spanheim was passing through Hanover (no doubt on his way to take over the Ambassadorship in Paris) he had orders from his master, the King, to sound our King, then the Elector, as to whether there were any means of coming to a better understanding between the two Protestant Churches, of which the theologians of

[1] Foucher, II. 191. [2] *Ibid.*, 491.

Brandenburg and of Brunswick, who were always the most moderate in the Empire, might lay the first foundations. This possibility was agreed upon, and Bishop Ursinus and Mr. Jablonski were nominated on one side and the Abbot Molanus on the other. Molanus desired that I should also be added to their number, and the Elector approved of this. We proceeded to discussion by word of mouth and by written word, and matters were advanced in no small measure." [1] The details of this general summary are well described by Guhrauer.[2] The Elector Frederick was determined on the first move. He gave command to Daniel Ernest Jablonski, whose opinions were quite moderate, to put down the preliminaries of Reunion. He composed an Irenicon in the German language with the crisp and searching title " Kurze Vorstellung der Einigkeit und des Unterschieds im Glauben bei den Protestirenden, nämlich Evangelischen und Reformirten." Spanheim had this document with him on his passage through Hanover. The central thought was important: " dass in den wichtigsten und nöthigsten Grundwahrheiten der christlichen Religion zwischen beiden Kirchen kein Unterschied und keine Ursache sich zu trennen sei." Hanover was bound to give an answer, and Leibnitz was entrusted with the duty of preparing it. He took the Calixtine theologians, Fabricius and Schmidt,[3] into his confidence, and on 16 March 1699 the result was published in the *Judicium Theologorum Helmstadtensium*. The Berlin proposals are described as " devout, orthodox, moderate, strictly fundamental and suitable for the purpose of the Reunion of the Church." [4] It might at first sight be thought that this conclusion differed in no way from the second step of mere toleration. But Molanus clarified this point. Mere toleration was a question of State policy; real Reunion was a Church question, and therefore universal. His attitude is fully expressed in a letter to Ursinus (1704). " It is therefore easy to guess," he writes, " that I must be among those who hold that our matters of controversy are not fundamental . . . and that Evangelicals of both sides (utriusque partis Evangelici) could very well come

[1] Foucher, II. 491, 492. [2] Guhrauer, II. 173 ff.
[3] The negotiations can be traced step by step in the correspondence of Leibnitz with Fabricius and Schmidt.
[4] Guhrauer, *in loco*.

to terms and coalesce once more into one Church without scruples of conscience. There should be formed out of the so-called diverse Evangelical and Reformed Churches an 'Ens per aggregatum unum, una eadem Sancta Catholica et Apostolica, eademque Evangelica simul et Reformata Ecclesia.' On this account Peace negotiations must not be the work of single States, for example of the Kingdom of Prussia, the Marks of Brandenburg, and Hesse, etc., but they must be dealt with as an universal effort." [1] We have already seen sufficient of his views on the ill effects of mere toleration, as instanced in the Conference at Cassel; in that case it is interesting to note that it was Molanus who dictated the substance while Leibnitz held the pen.[2]

Preparations were being made for a conference between the Berlin and Brunswick theologians, but propaganda work had to be done first among important and pivotal individuals. The theologians outside the Berlin Court had to be won over, and notably Philip Jacob Spener, one of Leibnitz's friends from youth, whose sectarian views had completely separated them. Spener had a great influence. It was therefore wisdom on the part of Leibnitz to compose a special tract ("Tentamentum Irenicum") for his enlightenment. It was sent to Spener without the name of the author, and an answer was published in his *Reflexiones supra Tentamentum Irenicum*.[3] The Quietist would not accept the philosophic discussions of Leibnitz on the Reformed dogma of predestination, nor on the Lutheran view of the Holy Communion; and he was full of doubts and difficulties as to the prospects of the whole Reunion plans.

The climax of this more hopeful period of Protestant Reunion was reached at the Hanover Conference of the summer of 1698. Jablonski was sent by the Elector of Brandenburg to discuss Reunion proposals with Molanus and Leibnitz. Friendliness and goodwill prevailed throughout the Conference. It was agreed that three points must be decided: (1) The removal of the discord about doctrine; (2) The removal of discord about Church customs, and (3) The removal of the variety of names given to the Protestant

[1] Guhrauer, *in loco*. [2] *Ibid*.

[3] This along with the "Tentamentum" is to be found in Spener's *Concilia Latina*.

sects. On the first point it was decided that mutual recriminations about erroneous doctrine had no point, because they were not fundamentally based; there was not sufficient difference between the two parties to prevent toleration of varied opinions. On the second point, ceremonies were to be left to freedom; and on the third point it was decided that the Protestant Church should be called Evangelical in contradistinction to the Roman Church. Henceforth the Western world would only have two Churches. The first was by far the most critical of the three questions. And Jablonski went back to Berlin with the hopeful news that the approval of both parties was assured if they could only agree "that in the doctrines which divided them there was really no essential divergence." Leibnitz and he carried on the negotiations by letter and in German.

Circumstances, however, turned the tide. The tempest of war, which drew both Hanover and Brandenburg into it, nipped the union efforts in the bud. Other interests also held Brandenburg and Brunswick in their grip. Brandenburg pursued and attained the position of King of Prussia; Hanover was set on the crown of England. "All this was bound to exert a direct influence on the efforts and action of Leibnitz." [1] Within Brandenburg itself there was a feeling of jealousy between the Ministers of State and the theologians. The fall of Dankelmann was a serious menace; after him jealousy seems to have become rife. No statesman seems to have wanted to touch a matter which had been handed over by the Elector to the theologians. The Minister of State, von Fuchs, had once been very keen on Reunion, but he had cooled in his interest by 25 August 1699, when Leibnitz wrote to Jablonski: "The distinguished Minister, von Fuchs, himself believes that little is to be done. It is thus natural that he, who has so much other business, should not bother about the matter for nothing." [2] Von Fuchs was nettled by these words, when Jablonski showed them to him, and excused himself in the style characteristic of a politician. "He saw special hindrances," he said, "like the indifference which revealed itself between the Courts of Hanover and Berlin, the attitude of the Hanoverian Court itself, and especially the intolerance

[1] Guhrauer, II. 180. [2] *Ibid.*, 179.

of the Lutheran clergy, which seems almost invincible." [1] There were further troubles among the Calvinists; some wanted to join with the Swiss, but Leibnitz was always against it, because the gap between the Lutherans and the Swiss Calvinists was much greater than that between the German Calvinists and their Lutheran neighbours.

The eighteenth century opened therefore with dim hopes for the Reunion of Protestantism in Germany. Events in the political world produced an anticlimax to the spirit of the Hanover Conference. But Leibnitz was not entirely without hope. On 27 Dec. 1701 he wrote to Fabricius from Berlin: "Reunion negotiations are not completely neglected here." [2] At the same time he was conscious of a developing distaste for such matters. Two years later (20 March 1703) he expressed himself to Fabricius in the following words: "Peace negotiations stagnate . . . while other cares, other projects disturb the courts"; "would that they were always of such a kind that the public weal requires!" [3]

This letter too was written from Berlin, where Leibnitz was watching the course of religious negotiations. Soon after his return to Hanover in the summer of 1703, a decisive step was taken by the formation of a "Collegium Irenicum" or "Collegium Charitativum." The King of Prussia set Bishop Ursinus of Bar in the Presidential Chair. Jablonski and Professor Strimesius of Frankfort, along with Ursinus, represented the Reformed Church; Provost Lütke of Coln on the Spree and Overseer Winkler represented the Lutherans. The numerical majority given to the Calvinists corresponded with their preponderance; this irritated Lütke, who withdrew almost immediately. Winkler, a man with little patience or insight, was left as the solitary adviser on the Lutheran side. It was his duty to keep in touch with Molanus, Schmidt, Fabricius and Leibnitz in Hanover and thus to promote Reunion. He succeeded in securing a resolution to the effect that nothing decisive

[1] From Jablonski's reply, 19 Sept. 1699: "er besondere Hinderungen dabei sehe, als die Kaltsinnigkeit welche sich zwischen dem Berlinischen und hanov: Hofes selbst, und sonderlich die Hartigkeit des evangelischen Clerus, welcher fast unüberwindlich schiene."

[2] Foucher, II. 427: "Res irenica hic non plane negligitur."

[3] Korthold, I. 83: "Aliæ curæ, alia studia agitant aulas; utinam semper qualia postulat publica salus!"

should be done without the consent of the Hanoverian theologians; but he ruined the prestige of the "Collegium Irenicum" by his *Arcanum Regium*, which, much to the disgust of Leibnitz, was published at Frankfort 1707.[1]

Slight revived expectations were raised by the marriage of the Calvinist Crown Prince of Prussia with the Lutheran Princess of Hanover (1706), especially as the latter was allowed to retain her own religious practices. When Prince Ulrich assumed the Regency at Wolfenbüttel, similar hopes were raised. Ursinus and Molanus were especially prominent, and the King of Prussia went so far as to distribute gold medals to the theologians, of which Molanus received one of fifty ducats. But these were the last flickerings of a dying fire. Leibnitz received a severe rebuke from the Duke of Hanover: he was to withdraw from all attempts at reuniting the Protestants (15 Nov. 1706). Such a stunning blow drove him to silence, and it was not until eighteen months afterwards that he uttered his final word to Fabricius: "As things now stand I expect nothing further from the scheme of union. Ipsa se res aliquando conficiet" (28 Jan. 1708).[2]

The failure of Reunion within Germany did not daunt the spirit of Leibnitz. He spent his last years in an attempt to reach an understanding with the English Church, and what was more surprising with the Church of Russia. As these schemes never reached anything more than the most elementary beginnings, it will be sufficient to add notes on the main items of importance.

Leibnitz and the Movements Towards Reunion in the Church of England

Reunion Movements in England and Scotland were numerous after the unsuccessful and farcical Conference at

[1] Leibnitz had counselled privacy, but John Joseph Winkler foolishly took no notice. He, moreover, stood out for the old Lutheran politico-religious system, by which the Prince was to tyrannise his subjects into religious obedience. A general visitation of religious inspectors was recommended and a drastic scheme of reform was proposed; among other things, no preacher was to be given office unless he had studied at Halle. The work of Winkler showed the cleavage which existed between the Prussian and Hanover Lutherans.

[2] Guhrauer, II. 234. It was a staggering blow to Leibnitz when Ulrich joined the Roman Church (1710).

Hampton Court, 1604. The names of John Durie of Edinburgh, who tried to unite Anglicans, Lutherans and Calvinists; of the Scottish Archbishop Robert Leighton, who attempted in vain to secure comprehension for the Presbyterians; and of Dean, afterwards Archbishop, Tillotson, whose tolerant opinions startled his more orthodox colleagues, are sufficient to remind us of the new spirit of conciliation which was maturing.

The Revolution of 1688 developed this spirit by a series of friendly relations with foreign Protestantism. "Reformed Continental Liturgies (so called) were translated into English. The Liturgy of Zürich was translated in 1693, and published with a prayer written by the Antistes of Zürich for the King and Queen of England." "Another Liturgy published is that of Neufchâtel, which contains a preface by Dr. Jablonski, Moravian Bishop, and Court Chaplain to the King of Prussia, urging the necessity of worship as distinct from sermons" (Bouquet, p. 164).

With the intimate union of Hanover and England came a still greater impetus towards efforts for Reunion. Before the arrival of the Elector George of Hanover in England (Sept. 1714), Jablonski, who was also Court preacher (at the Prussian Court), had written a Memoir to the King of Prussia, in which he describes the relation of the Hierarchy to the Royal power and recommends the introduction of Episcopacy into Prussia. He quotes the saying of James I, 'No Bishop, no King,' in support of his thesis. In 1704 the English Liturgy was translated into German, and copies were sent to Leibnitz and to the Archbishop of Canterbury by Bishop Ursinus.

A letter was written to the Archbishop of Canterbury in the name of the King, in which mention was made of the proposal to introduce Episcopacy into the Church of Prussia, and asking his advice. When the letter was unanswered (the Archbishop said later that he had not received the letter), political questions also intervening, the matter was dropped for some years. It was taken up again in 1710 by the King of Prussia. A lively correspondence took place between Jablonski and the Archbishop of York (John Sharp), in which the English Ambassador, Lord Raby, and his chaplain, Ayerst, and John Bolingbroke the Secretary of State took part; on the Prussian side Freiherr

von Printz and Bonnell the Ambassador in London wrote something. The interesting fact is that Leibnitz was staying in Berlin at the time. Ayerst turned to him for advice. Almost at once he entered into negotiations with Jablonski and the Archbishop of York to work for the realisation of the plan. The correspondence went on for some years. Traces of it are found in a work which appeared in London, 1760, under the title " Rélation des mesures qui furent prises dans les années 1711, 1712 et 1713 pour introduire la liturgie anglicane dans le royaume de Prusse et dans l'électorat de Hannover, extrait d'un Manuscrit contenant des mémoires de la vie du docteur Jean Harp, Archevêque d'York " (dedicated to Frederick the Great). A second edition came out later with the addition " traduit de l'Anglois par J. T. Muysson." Or again in " Darlegung der im vorigen Jahrhundert wegen Einführung der englischen Kirchenverfassung in Preussen gepflogenen Unterhandlungen. Urkundlich belegt mit Briefen von . . . Jablonski . . . von Printzen . . . Erzbischof von York . . . St. John (Bolingbroke), Leibnitz und Andern " (the unnamed editor makes a secret of the original from which he made his translation).—Guhrauer, *Anmerkungen*, II. 23, and text II. 242 ff. The result of the negotiations was disappointing. The project was found to have no deep need in Church or State, and to have risen merely from a pious wish of the King of Prussia. The death of Frederick I (Feb. 1713) put an end to it, since his successor had a distinct aversion to England.

But Leibnitz was persistent in his personal efforts. A letter in Foucher's Collection to the Princess of Wales shows the keenness of his interest in Reunion just before his death. It is without date, but is dated by Foucher and Pichler about 1716 (Leibnitz died 14 Nov. 1716). He seeks to renew the broken negotiations between the Churches of Hanover, Brandenburg and England. He regards the English Church as the Mediator and link between Calvinist and Lutherans (Foucher, II. 493). But the important matter was to influence the Archbishop of Canterbury himself. Leibnitz had no fears in pressing this need upon the Princess. " The great question now remains: With whom could Your Royal Highness secretly confer in order to win the interest of the Archbishop of Canterbury? "

(The reference is to Thomas Tenison, who died at the age of 79 at the end of 1715.)

Before the letter was completed Tenison was succeeded in the archbishopric by William Wake, Bishop of Lincoln. The letter describes him as "endowed with much zeal, moderation and skill." Leibnitz adds a P.S. to the effect that he has seen his elevation to Canterbury in the *Gazette*, and that it only remains for him to change the terms of his letter to meet the new situation. "You must speak yourself once more," he instructs the Princess, "to the Primate, but without showing any appearance that I have the least share in it."

This letter is interesting as the dying wish of Leibnitz; but it also may have been an inspiration to Archbishop Wake, through the constant influence of the Princess, to carry on a correspondence with the Gallican Church (1717–1720), which Dr. J. H. Lupton has described in his *Archbishop Wake and the Project of Union Between the Gallican and Anglican Churches*, London, 1896. Did the Princess of Wales influence the Archbishop in this correspondence as a memento of the work of Leibnitz, who died a few months after writing the above letter on Church Unity?

Leibnitz and the Eastern Church

Leibnitz's efforts for Church unity extended beyond the narrower boundaries of the Protestant and Roman Churches to the great Orthodox Church of the East. At first his motive for entering on such a tremendous task was based on his keen interest in Church unity in general, but more particularly on the historic precedent which the Council of Florence offered for the widening of the representation of Christendom at a General Council. If the Greeks were allowed to take part in an Œcumenical Council, why not the Protestants? He may also have read the account of the hopes, which were raised at the Council of Pisa, of a Universal Church. Nothing could have stirred him more than extracts like the following from the works of Gerson. "We have now one fixed Pope," says Gerson in a sermon before the King of France on the election of Alexander V, "a Pope who is a clever Doctor of Theology, so that he well knows the nature of this division with the Greeks. He is a

Greek by nationality, a man of great experience. . . . Moreover, a General Council is to be held within three years at which the Greeks may appear. The Emperor and his Greek subjects urgently desire this union and peace" (Sermo coram rege Franciæ, du Pin II. 141 ff.).

Leibnitz was fond of quoting the Council of Florence, *e.g.* after a letter to Bossuet, dated 8 April 1692, he adds the following note: "Eugenius IV . . . qui græcos licet toties in Occidente damnatos et calamitatibus fractos ac prope modum supplices, non superbe rejecit, aut alienis decretis parere jussit, sed in ipsum Consilium Florentinum sententiam dicturos admisit" (Dutens, I. 536).

Leibnitz's interest in the Eastern Church was increased by the relations of Peter the Great to the Court of Hanover. In October 1711 he accompanied Prince Anton Ulrich to Torgau, where the daughter of the Prince was to be married to the son of the Czarevitch. Peter and Leibnitz met for the first time.[1] The attempt of the Czar to bring Russia into line with the chief States of Europe appealed to the vast mind of Leibnitz. "I have made a trip to Torgau," he writes to Fabricius on 8 Dec. 1711, "not so much for the wedding festivities as to see the great Czar of Russia, and I do not regret it."[2] In the summer of 1712 Peter invited him to a second meeting, when he nominated him to a pension of a thousand thalers for his brilliant work in reference to the foundation of an Academy at S. Petersburg on the lines of those at Berlin, Dresden, etc. (it was not founded until after the death of the Czar). Both men believed that culture must come from above before the body of the people could be reached. The third and last meeting with the Czar took place in July 1716 in Pyrmont, and in the same month at Herrenhausen, where the Czar was awaiting the arrival of the King of England. On the 3rd of July Leibnitz wrote to Sebastian Kortholt that he was "full of admiration, not only for the humanity but also for the ripe knowledge and keen judgment of such a Prince" (Guhrauer, II. 276).

Two letters have been discovered in the archives at Moscow. They are written in German, and are from the

[1] Although in July 1697 Peter came to the Hanover Castle of Koppenbruck incognito and Leibnitz did not approach him then.

[2] Guhrauer, II. 273.

pen of Leibnitz to the Czar. At the time they appeared in the *Russkij Wiastnik* and were printed later in the *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes Jahrg.*, 1842, No. 136, 137 (Guhrauer, *Anmerkungen*, II. 76). The first letter is dated from Vienna 26 Oct. 1713; it is of less importance than the second, which has no date but seems to be the same year or later. Leibnitz expresses his wish that "Collegia" be introduced into the State, so that its machinery can be co-ordinated. We notice that among the nine "Collegia" a place is given to Religion. The remainder are—State, War, Finance, Politics, Justice, Commerce, Revision, and the Literary. There may be more treasures in the archives of Moscow.

For our purpose it is important to notice that the religious aspect of his negotiations with Russia developed as the Roman Church appeared more and more unflinching in its attitude. Especially was this the case after the Ryswick Peace (Sept. 1697). He preached a gospel of Reunion between the Protestants of Germany and the Church in Russia; he advised the Czar to send young students to Protestant universities and not to Padua, where they were filled with Papal fallacies (to Cuneau, 4 July 1697; *Berlinische Bibliothek*, I. 136). A good deal of his policy was based on political hatred of France at this time. But there is no doubt but that his eye was always set on the convocation of a true Œcumenical Council, which the Czar himself had proposed and in which the Eastern Patriarchs would have a voice. The correspondence of Leibnitz with Urbich, the Russian Ambassador in Vienna, throws more light on the subject.[1] On 15 October 1710 Urbich wrote to assure him that he had talked the matter over with the Czar, and that Peter the Great had proposed Leibnitz as the man to undertake the arrangements for the Convocation of the Eastern Patriarchs; but that there were obstacles in the way, owing to the Turkish War. Leibnitz answered, Nov. 1710, that the Sultan could scarcely grant permission for the Patriarchs who were under his rule to attend, and "without them it could not be regarded as an Œcumenical Council." Much care was to be taken as regards Rome. Leibnitz advised that the Ambassador, Prince Anton Ulrich, should be taken into

[1] Pichler, II. 502.

confidence, but Urbich was against the proposal on the grounds that the Prince might be "too inquisitive and the affair would become too public" (Pichler, II. 502). Leibnitz on his part explained himself on 14 Dec. 1710, and agreed that it was best to take extreme measures of precaution. "L'affaire est de la dernière importance," he said, "et peut causer un grand bien et un grand mal selon qu'elle est menagée" (Pichler, II. 503). England was to be swept into the scheme, but the war put an end to all. Leibnitz's universal efforts at unity seemed for the moment doomed. He had commenced with hope in the liberal attitude of the Gallican Church. But his attempts to unite Rome and Protestantism failed; he was bitterly disappointed at the result of his next project at reconciling Calvinists and Lutherans, and now, a few years before his death, his last plans had failed. His only hope was that the controversies would bear fruit in posterity.

There are two interesting sidelights on the negotiations with the Eastern Church. In a letter from the Duchess of Hanover to the Abbess of Maubuisson, dated 10 Sept. 1691, the former asks, "if Madame de Brinon has read a book where the journey of a Nuncio to Mont-Liban is mentioned; the Nuncio has received Greeks into the Catholic Church, which differs much more from their Church than yours does from ours; and they have been permitted, as you will see in this story, to allow their priests to marry, as is their custom." I do not doubt, in view of the interest of Leibnitz in the Eastern Church and of his great friendliness with the Duchess, that the book referred to was presented to her by none other than Leibnitz himself.

Another interesting reference is given by Johann Leonhard Frisch in the *Biog. Univ. Art. Frisch* (T. xvi, p. 72), referred to by Guhrauer (*Anmerkungen*, II. 37). Leibnitz in his later life is said to have learned Russian. It may be that he desired to come into closer touch with the Eastern Church by this means, though, of course, he may have felt the need of it in his plans for an Academy in S. Petersburg.

The general attitude of Leibnitz to the Eastern Church is clear. He looked on it as a Church free from the bureaucratic influences of the Papacy and in closer correspondence with the Early Church than the Church of Rome. But

he did not regard it as having reached the perfection of the Christian Ideal of the Church.

In the midst of these tentative and nascent schemes, and with his historical researches still unfinished, Leibnitz was cut off at the age of 71 (14 Nov. 1716). He had voluntarily accepted the arduous office of conciliator in the negotiations between the Churches; he had left no avenue unexplored along which he might find a safe road into other folds; but ultimately every avenue had proved a cul-de-sac. And he had deprived himself of the fellowship which he had always tried to foster. His death was bitterly lonely. Eckhart declares that, though every member of the Court was invited to follow the body to the grave, he was himself the only mourner of the great man.[1] A Scotsman, John Ker of Kersland, who was a friend of Leibnitz, was in Hanover during the funeral; he was shocked to see that "Leibnitz was buried more like a robber than what he really was—the ornament of his country."[2] Almost his last wish was that he might see fruit from his past labours; but that fruit was to be gathered by posterity.

[1] Guhrauer, *in loco*.
[2] *Memoirs of John Ker*, I. 118: London, 1727.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

" Thus, even Leibnitz, that rich, all-harmonising mind, is he as moving as Tertullian, that vehement, one-sided genius, or even as some of Leibnitz's own contemporaries, smaller and less balanced, but more concentrated and instinctive than that serene negotiator of the large wig, amidst the Pontiffs and Princesses of his day?"—VON HUGEL in the *Constructive Quarterly*, 1914, p. 68.

" It looks as though we must work only for posterity."—Leibnitz to Pelisson, 19 Nov. 1682: FOUCHER, I. 337 in 1st edit., 409 in 2nd edit.

" For a period of more than fifty years Leibnitz was busily engaged on theological and ecclesiastical questions."—PICHLER, I. 133.

IN the foregoing pages an attempt has been made to tell the story of the relation of Leibnitz to the Churches. Englishmen know his legal, mathematical and philosophical work, but up to the present there is no more or less exhaustive account of his religious activities. And if the contention of these pages is correct, that the chief interest of Leibnitz was a religious one, then our view of Leibnitz is distorted and unsatisfactory without full consideration of this aspect of his work. For more than half a century he pursued one aim. The urgency of the times, which were always on the verge of a confessional war, touched him deeply. The embroilment of politics by religious passion made him struggle for a wider view of religion and the Church against the land principle of Lutheran theologians. The inspiration of Baron von Boineburg in his early years led him definitely towards the problem of Reunion as the supreme interest of his life, to which he would subordinate all his other interests. The *Systema*, the *Théodicée*, the *Tentamentum Irenicum* and kindred works like those published in the first two volumes of Foucher glow with this supreme passion; and his last efforts were spent in historical studies for the good of the

Church. No other conclusion can be drawn from the length and persistence of his religious correspondence, from his abounding energy and hope in the face of repeated failure, and from the hope which he placed in the judgment of posterity on Christian Reunion.

While we have attempted to tell a full and connected story of this aspect of Leibnitz from the documents at our disposal, we have not been unconscious of the pitfalls along the way. Great circumspection is needed by the student of this subject. French and German scholars have forgotten that criticism must accompany description throughout. There is scarcely a point on which glaring errors have not been made. Some have repeated the foolish charge of indifferentism against the religion of Leibnitz, or have taken the milder course of putting his philosophic motive first in his religious activities; the numerous views held about the *Systema* are enough to perplex the most learned; while errors in the date of the Spinola negotiations and over the "Last Letter" in the Bossuet correspondence prove that most writers are fond of following other scholars rather than of investigating for themselves. Some of the best German scholars are mere plagiarists of Guhrauer, and they have followed his great work along the high-road and into the ditches.

The question, however, remains. Did Leibnitz solve the problem to which he had devoted his life? No and yes. Practical and immediate measures of Reunion are sought in vain; in fact, every henotic movement failed. But he had sown richly germinating ideas, the harvest of which he was content to leave to the future.[1] By his life and labours he stamped his personality on his people; not immediately, but by death and resurrection. The corn of wheat had to die in loneliness, but after death it brought forth much fruit. As year by year his works were unearthed his personality, isolated by its greatness from his contemporaries, made its impression on the religious life of Europe. His boundless energy staggered his explorers. Three characteristics of his mental and spiritual life made a much-needed impression on succeeding generations. First, what we have emphasised so often, his sincerity. A quotation from the Catholic Foucher reminds us how important

[1] See Pichler, II. 514.

it is to maintain this fact. Leibnitz was quite distinct from the superficial deists or the unbelieving philosophers (des déistes superficiels et des philosophes incrédules); "he is very far from being indifferent in religious matters according to the reproach which is levelled at him," and "if interest and ambition had been his idols he would have been a Catholic long before" [1] Bossuet's correspondence. Secondly, his stupendous knowledge. E. H. Fichte ranks him with the three geniuses of the first order, Plato, Aristotle and Kant.[2] His encyclopædic researches into every department of thought and his undoubted superiority on this score over Bossuet in correspondence are outstanding evidence. Thirdly, his charity. What Lutheran of his day could have written such a sane and noble summary of the Apocalypse as that in the Appendix to Foucher's second volume,[3] or the very modern account in a letter to the Landgrave? [4] His charity was unbounded. This combination, indeed, of sincerity, knowledge and charity in religious matters was exactly what Germany needed for her salvation. It was for lack of one or another of these gifts that the religious parties of that generation were disorganised.

To Leibnitz therefore, more than to any single person, must be attributed the slaughter of the sect spirit in Germany. If the Law and the Prophets are represented by the Peace of Augsburg and the Peace of Westphalia, there can be no doubt that Leibnitz was the John the Baptist of the modern idea of religious toleration.[5] After the impact of his spirit on his people there could be no more confessional war. This was one of the by-products of his irenics, according to his own law "that the more difficult the solution of the problem is, the more fruitful will be the attempts made at its solution." [6] It would be impossible to overrate the importance of these facts [7] in the preparation of the German nation. But it is sufficient to notice that Leibnitz the philosopher and mathematician would have remained aloof from this whole movement, and his influence on the

[1] Foucher, II. lxxxvi.
[2] Pichler, II. 1.
[3] Foucher, II. 497.
[4] Rommel, II. 27.
[5] Foucher, II. cv. Moreover, it would be impossible to overstate the importance of Leibnitz for the security of the Reformation. He saved the Reformation from its own weaknesses.
[6] Foucher, II. civ.
[7] Pichler has made a special study of this.

nation can only be understood from a comprehensive study of his religious efforts.

The plans for Reunion seemed to fail. It is even arguable that Rome was better off afterwards than before.[1] No less than seventeen princes joined the Roman Church under the compulsion of the spirit of inquiry that was aroused. But Leibnitz had detailed the general programme for all future irenics. Two ways lay open: Protestants could seek Reunion with Rome, or they could unite with each other and with the Greek Church. This was the first occasion that the complete scheme was adumbrated; and, since Leibnitz, Reunion has taken these general directions.

On Reunion with Rome the work of Leibnitz is highly instructive to-day, when preliminaries are under discussion between representatives of the Anglican and Roman Communions at Malines, and when we are to expect some discussion of the subject at the approaching General Council. Such a moment is full of hope. Chateaubriand records a conversation which he had with Leo XII at Rome, where he was French Ambassador. "Would Your Holiness not agree," he said, "that the time is favourable for the re-establishment of Catholic unity, for the reconciliation of dissident sects by slight concessions on discipline? Prejudice against the Roman Court is being obliterated everywhere . . . and the work of Reunion has already been tried by Leibnitz and Bossuet." The Holy Father replied: "That is a great undertaking . . . I must await the moment fixed by Providence." [2] Has that moment arrived for the Papacy? It was under similar circumstances to those of our time that Pichler wrote his splendid work *Die Theologie des Leibniz* (1869) in anticipation of the General Council of 1870. The Catholic Episcopate seemed well disposed to the opinions of Leibnitz, and he felt that the "knowledge of the opinions of such an earnestly religious and Christian-minded man as Leibnitz would be of great interest." [3]

The times are even more opportune to-day, when the spirit of Fellowship in religion has advanced tremendously and when the world-consciousness, aroused by the Great War and by the growing means of communication between nation and nation, make for co-operation everywhere. But

[1] Foucher gives a summary of the reasons for their failure (II. ciii).
[2] Foucher, II. cvii. [3] *Ibid.*, I. 337.

no discussion on Reunion can dispense with the record of the greatest discussion in history, between Bossuet and Leibnitz, the outstanding champions of the respective Churches; or with the generous and highly important terms contained in the "Regulæ" and the *Cogitationes*. From the former, Rome must surely learn what one of her own children has pointed out: "When we negotiate with the Protestants we are too ready to think that, speaking in the name of the objective Church and sharing in some way her infallibility, we are exempt from charity." [1] Rome must cease to take the attitude of Mme. de Brinon, who invited Leibnitz to return to the Father's House as the Prodigal. From the latter she must find a starting-point for her negotiations; for the documents of Molanus, Leibnitz and their colleagues were drawn up with most perfect care and consideration, and represent the most conciliatory terms ever considered by Rome. They were pleasing to Pope and Cardinals at the time, and should prove a suitable starting-point for present discussion in spite of the increased divisions in the Church.

In reference to the Reunion of Protestants, Leibnitz emphasised two facts. First, the necessity of attaining a civil, religious and theological unity among Protestants in order to remove the Catholic charge of "variation" and to meet the Roman Church with one front.[2] The numerous movements which have this object to-day would receive his sanction, if they are set on the object of mounting the third step in his ladder of Protestant Reunion. Secondly, the necessity of a European or indeed a world Protestant Reunion, in which the Greek Church has a share. This point has been taken up to-day by the Bishop of Durham in his book on *Anglicanism*, especially in relation to the Church in Sweden. And indeed those who see little hope in Reunion with Rome are rapidly looking in this direction for immediate schemes of Reunion. High Churchmen, who have despaired of Rome, have looked towards Russia and the Greek Church for encouragement (as the Bishop of Truro).

But the fundamental contribution of Leibnitz to modern irenics is the quest which he made for a true idea of the Church. His whole correspondence reveals this. From

[1] Foucher, II. lxxxv, lxxxvi.

[2] As at the approaching Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne where 96 Communions will be represented.

his "Catholic" period at Mainz to his last letters to Fabricius, he was seeking a reconciling theory of the Church which would prepare the way of peace. His experiments in the "Inner Communion," or the Church based on the "Love of God," are attempts to reach a true and satisfactory principle of harmony. He was critical towards all parties; the Ultramontanes were hard and legal in their definitions; even the Gallicans left no room for the Protestants, who by their life and doctrine showed that they desired union with the Mother Church; the Protestants were bitter and divided to such an extent that division multiplied itself unceasingly. It is true that he died before his quest was complete, but he has made it plain that the first step towards real Reunion depends on the possibility of reaching a true definition of the Church.

This surely had been the quest of the early Gallicans themselves. Jean Charlier de Gerson had fashioned a theory of the Church on the principles of the Conciliar Movement,[1] and the fact that it differed so largely from that of the Ultramontane school led naturally to a permanent though not organic division in the Church of Rome. And, since Leibnitz, many writers have pointed out the same quest to the divided Church. Some higher synthesis than any present system is needed. "If the Confessional ice-rind will thaw and melt," said Döllinger, "a higher unity and harmony springs up." [2] "On all unprejudiced and thoughtful men," wrote Diepenbrock, "dawns the pre-

[1] Leibnitz always looked back to the Conciliar Period as the time of lost opportunity for the Church (see above, pp. 132, 159, and the most emphatic statement on p. 189). It is most interesting to remember that the greatest scholars of this movement were working in close touch with him. In fact, Hermann von der Hardt had been in charge of the Library at Wolfenbüttel under Rudolph Augustus, and his great publications on the Conciliar Period came out at Frankfort and Leipzig in 1696 ff. Of Jacques l'Enfant, the other great scholar of the Conciliar Movement, an interesting fact is preserved by Guhrauer (*Anmerkungen*, II, 87). It is contained in a letter of Leibnitz to Prince Anton Ulrich, 4 August 1710. L'Enfant wrote to Leibnitz telling him that he wanted to come to Wolfenbüttel to study the Council of Constance. Leibnitz wrote to the Librarian asking him to treat the Frenchman with every consideration, and seeks confirmation of his action from the Prince. It is clear therefore that Leibnitz had all the sources of the Conciliar Movement at his command as no other librarian in Europe. Wolfenbüttel was a mine of information on all periods of Church History, but more than ever of the Conciliar Period.

[2] Döllinger, *König Maximilian II und die Wissenschaft*, p. 35 (Pichler, II. 517).

sentiment of the need of a newly formed Church." [1] And at least one great mind of our generation has emphasised this point. In fact, it might be true to say that in this respect Ernst Troeltsch [2] is Leibnitz Redivivus. He has taken up the problem under our new conditions, but at the point where Leibnitz left off his struggles. In him we find the same sincerity of purpose, the same extensive knowledge and charity, with the same devotion to history. Troeltsch has himself declared that his historical outlook and methodology are similar to that of Leibnitz.[3] His objective view of history and religion correspond very closely with the attempt of Leibnitz to keep the pure essence of religion as an objective and certain reality. But, above all, his critical view of the Church and his attempt to find a way out of the impasse of civilisation and Christianity are akin to the mind of his great predecessor.[4]

One more question remains. What was the effect of his religious efforts on Leibnitz himself? It might be said here that he was wasting his energy over a hopeless task, just as his contemporaries blamed him for turning his mind to the minute genealogies of Brunswick. At any rate he suffered the wounds in himself. He might have died as a hero, but he preferred to die as a martyr. He had thrown aside all worldly honours for his supreme aim; he had struggled and wrestled with theology and with Church history and with religious correspondents of every sort; he had heaped upon himself the imprecations of every party by his all-conciliatory spirit (*Alles-Vermittler*, Troeltsch, Band I. 927). If there is any charge to be made against Leibnitz, it is surely not his religious indifference nor his philosophical religiousness, but his failure to see that Reunion is not the work of individuals [5] but a corporate movement in which more than a few ardent souls must take part. It must spring from the consciousness of the whole group of

[1] To Passavant (Pichler, II. 528).

[2] Died Jan. 1923.

[3] R. S. Sleigh, p. 49.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 245. N.B. It was the quest for a new and true conception of the Church which led Leibnitz through that peculiar development, which we have outlined on pp. 182 ff.

[5] Baron von Hügel has touched the secret of the failure of Leibnitz to grip the emotional appreciation of his contemporaries and of many later religious enthusiasts. His outlook was too cautiously whole and balanced; attractiveness thrives on obsessions. A whole host of misunderstandings arise from the failure to realise this wholeness of Leibnitz. [See heading to chapter.]

the separate Churches concerned, and not from a few pious or clever people within them.

To-day this larger attitude prevails. Rome alone waits. "To wait," however, "was always the policy of Rome. But in waiting for the moment fixed by Providence we must work as though it were near." [1] The approaching General Council will reveal her mind. Meanwhile "Laboremus."

[1] Foucher, II. cvii.

APPENDIX

I

ROYAL CONVERSIONS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE

It is necessary to be cautious in the use of the argument that Royal conversions imply the progress of Romanism. The Landgrave Ernest of Hessen-Rheinfels is an outstanding case of a sincere conversion, but he himself confesses that there were far too many cases where political considerations took a larger place than religious convictions. He complained more than once of the "decorated accounts and unctuous encomium of the Jesuits over the number and excellence of the qualifications of the Protestants whom they had converted." In many cases the converts were unedifying creatures. The Landgrave gives—

(1) A list of German Princesses who had refused important matrimonial prospects which entailed a change of religion (in his essay "Sur trois Princesses Allemandes qui ont refusé des grands mariages pour demeurer fermes en leur Religion," 1690).

A Princess of Hessen-Darmstadt refused the Archduke Sigismund of Innsbruck, a Princess of Sachsen-Eisenach refused the Elector of Bavaria, a Princess of Brandenburg-Baireuth refused the new Elector Palatine, on these grounds. The Landgrave feels that if the good of the State calls for such marriages, the Protestants should be granted indulgence as "material" and not be treated as "formal" heretics. His own sister Magdalene married the Catholic Graf von Salm in 1646, but retained her own Evangelical preacher. But in contrast to the faithful Princesses he gives—

(2) A list of Princes who to his own knowledge had gone over to the Church of Rome within a century. The greater part of them had been led over by worldly considerations, and their conversions have had almost no influence on their people and their country.

Jacob von Baden converted by the celebrated Pistorius.

This was an honest conversion, the result of a conference in Italy with the Jesuits, in consequence of which the Margrave declared: "If it is impossible to produce evidence of a wholly Lutheran Church before Luther, it is necessary to seek another more rightful Church."

Wolfgang Wilhelm von Pfalz-Neuburg, who has been wrongly blamed for entering the Roman Church in order to win possession of Juliers.

Christian von Brandenburg, Administrator of Magdeburg, who was taken captive by Tilly and kept in custody in Austria, and converted under the influence, first of the Jesuits of Bavaria and then of Father Lamormain, the Emperor's confessor. A sincere conversion to which he remained constant.

Julian Heinrich von Sachsen-Lauenburg, a drunkard who at a banquet promised to enter the Roman Church. He did not want to break this promise, which he had made to the Austrian officers present. He lived later as a Protestant, but without participating in the Evangelical Communion.

Friedrich von Hessen-Darmstadt, the youngest son of Louis V, converted in 1636 on a journey to Italy by two cardinals. He was leading a prodigal and loose life at the time. His elevation to the cardinal's hat and to the Archbishopric of Breslau is ascribed to the buffoonery of the Jesuit Beck, who had a great influence with the Emperor, and who succeeded in getting the Emperor to pledge him anything which he sought, provided that it was neither for himself nor for his Order.

Eduard, younger son of the Count Palatine and unlucky King of Bohemia (Friedrich). He was taken to Paris when he was quite young, and was later married to Anna Gonzaga de Nevers (whose sister was Louise-Hollandine Abbess of Maubuisson).

Ulrich, Prince of Würtemberg, a brave but rough and drunken cavalry officer in the Imperial and Spanish service, who had a love intrigue with a beautiful Catholic lady in Brussels. He fell with Spain and gave a wretched example of relapse.

Georg Christian von Hessen-Homburg, a younger son of Frederick I, who for similar reasons and without proof of his religious conviction came over to Rome in Brussels.

Christian von Pfalz-Sulzbach, a devout and cultured

man, being persuaded by the Archbishop Joh. Philip of Mainz and his kinsman the Elector of Pfalz-Neuburg, was converted with his wife. People have slanderously reported that he did so in order to put himself on favourable terms with the Count Palatine.

JOHANN FRIEDRICH VON BRAUNSCHWEIG-LUNEBURG-HANNOVER (celebrated for his numerous journeys to Italy), the son-in-law of Edward of the Palatine, an amiable and generous man, although at the same time very corpulent. (See Soldan and Hock for him and also for Duke of Wolfenbüttel, converted in 1710.)

CHRISTIAN VON MECKLENBURG-SCHWERIN, whom the King of France placed in the Bastille because of his intrigues, and who was not an eager Catholic.

GUSTAV ADOLF VON BADEN-DURLACH, a younger son of Frederick V, once a Swedish and then an Austrian General, converted in Rome, was first a keen follower of the Carmelites, then of the Benedictines, becoming Abbot of Fulda, the richest Abbey in Germany.

ALBRECHT VON SACHSEN-WEISSENBURG, who was converted while in the service of Venice by the Archbishop of Spalatro. He kept his conversion secret for a time, but afterwards entered the Imperial service in Hungary and married a rich Princess of Lowenstein-Werthheim.

Three younger Princes of Holstein, of which the Landgrave knows nothing further except that they were poor and passed a short time in the Imperial service.

JOH. LUDWIG FÜRST VON NASSAU-HADAMAR, who married the devout and steadfast Calvinist Ursula von der Lippe, was persuaded by the Jesuits to become a Roman Catholic before the arrival of Gustavus Adolphus. The Emperor sent him as Envoy to the Peace of Westphalia.

"*All these conversions, far from offering a proof of the superiority of one of the two Communions, had, with the exception of the conversion of an elector of Saxony, achieved at a later date, no influence on the numerous German territories and kingdoms, which had done homage with such enthusiasm to the principle of the Reformation in the days of Luther and Zwingli that, apart from the reaction of Austria and Bavaria, almost all Germany might have withdrawn itself from the Roman Pope.*" [1]

[1] Rommel, I. 48 ff.

II

THE *COGITATIONES PRIVATÆ* OF MOLANUS

Cogitationes privatæ de Methodo Reunionis Ecclesiæ Protestantium cum Ecclesia Romano-Catholica, by a theologian "sincerely attached to the Confession of Augsburg." The "Thoughts" were to be sent to the Bishop of Meaux for his private examination. Molanus, however, makes it clear that he acts "with the consent of his superiors." It was all-important to keep his "Private Thoughts" from public discussion.

Union is possible and everybody must work for it. "I speak of such a reunion as may take place without violence to the conscience or prejudice to the reputation of either party, and such as to leave untouched the principles and hypotheses of both Churches."

"It is plain from the very nature of the case that nothing should be assumed as granted upon both sides which is denied by either, and that the domineering claim for retractation of errors is not even entitled to a thought; but that, on the contrary, the attention of the parties should be exclusively devoted to a lucid exposition, a suitable declaration, or a temperate softening down of the controverted dogmas; and that should all these fail, or should they be out of place in any particular controversy, both sides should abstain from any recrimination and invective and reserve the controverted matters for the judgment of a legitimate Council."

Errors that are not fundamental should be mutually tolerated according to the laws of Christian Charity as in the Council of Jerusalem, when the Gentiles were to observe the same rule as the Jews.

SIX POSTULATES essential—"No one of which is of such a nature that the Roman Church may not, as a tender Mother, graciously allow it to her ancient children."

(1) That the Pope hold as true members of the Church

such Protestants as submit to the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy and to a legitimate Council, " notwithstanding their persuasion that henceforth and for ever Communion must be celebrated under both species by their adherents." The Pope, " without derogating from the principles and hypotheses of his Church," can allow all Protestants to retain their custom without hindering the unity of the Church. " When the Bohemians once made a disturbance about this question, the Pope granted them the use of the chalice without any difficulty."

(2) " The Pontiff should be satisfied not to force on Protestant Churches what are called Private Masses or those Masses in which the priest alone communicates," not because it is simply unlawful, " since even in their own Churches their pastors in cases of necessity themselves receive the Lord's Supper without anyone else being present," etc., but since the Gospel shows that others were present to receive, and history shows many abuses, and in " Protestant Churches there remains not a vestige of the numberless altars intended for such private use."

(3) " The Pope should consent to leave unproscribed and free from all censure to the aforementioned Churches their doctrines touching the Justification of the Sinner before God." There is no real difference in the opinions of the two Churches. " The controversy like a saw has been drawn hither and thither, regarding not the matter itself but only the various acceptations of the terms employed." " It is true that the Catholics usually place the formal notion of justification in the infusion of sanctifying Grace, whereas the Protestants maintain that the word 'justification' should be understood in a forensic sense and as signifying nothing more than the non-imputation of sin in consideration of the merits of Christ." But Calixtus and Horneius of Helmstadt and the Bros. Adrian and Peter von Walenburch and the Capuchin Denis of Werle in his *Via Pacis* " have all observed that this controversy could be brought to an end by a favourable explanation of the terms."

(4) " That the Pope be pleased to permit to the Protestant pastors the right of marriage and even of a second marriage upon the death of their wives until a Council have decided the question." Celibacy is founded on human and not on Divine Law, and consequently can be abrogated

by human hands. The Council of Florence gave permission of marriage to the Greeks who were invited.

(5) "The Pope be pleased to confirm and hold as valid the ordinations hitherto performed by Protestants, and to do this in a way which will be acceptable on both sides, will not prejudice either party, and will be calculated to set the faithful at rest, as far as possible, touching the administration of the Sacraments." This must be done before the Council in order to prevent any doubt about the validity of the Sacraments in the minds of the Roman Catholics.

(6) "That the Sovereign Pontiff shall so deal with the Protestant Electors, Princes, Counts, and other States of the Roman Empire, agreeably to the right and authority which in virtue of the Treaty of Passau and the Peace of Westphalia they have or claim to have over the clergy and the affairs of religion, that the said temporal Lords may not oppose themselves to these religious efforts for union, but may rather be gently induced to promote a design so salutary. And that the Sovereign Pope can effect such and even greater things is sufficiently apparent from the Concordats between the Roman and the French Churches, and from the principles now maintained by the Doctors of the Sorbonne, and amongst them by M. Lewis Elias Dupin in his historical Dissertations upon the Ancient Discipline of the Church, which are no less remarkable for their learning than for their candour." If the Pope grants these things the Protestants will promise—

(*a*) "That as the Bishop of Rome holds the first place or primary rank and dignity amongst all the Bishops of the Christian world and consequently in the universal Church, and possesses besides by ecclesiastical Law in the Western or Latin Church the Primacy and Patriarchal privileges; they will therefore esteem and reverence the Sovereign Pontiff as the Supreme Patriarch or first Bishop of the entire Church, and will pay him due homage in spiritual matters."

(*b*) They will treat Roman Catholics as brethren in Christ, disregarding their communion in one kind and other questions of controversy.

(*c*) Priests are to be subject to their Bishops and Bishops to Archbishops according to the established Hierarchy.

Charity must be the primary law and allow the practice of conscientious duties. Two rules follow. A greater precept must be observed before a lesser. If a neighbour is sick on Sunday I must go to relieve him, though "by the consequent journey and neglect of religious duties the Sabbath must be violated." And charity must precede schism. The Pope could not give the cup to Spain, Portugal and Italy without terrible results.

On the Course to be Pursued (Modus Agendi). "A secret and honourable understanding being arrived at on both sides, the Electors, Dukes, Princes and other States of the German Empire, Romanists as well as Protestants, shall be invited by the Roman Emperor each to send to a Congress one or two doctors, equally notable for learning and moderation, to confer upon the Union of the Churches." These questions fall into three classes.

(1) "To the first class shall belong those controversies which regard equivocal expressions or diversely received terms"—as, for instance, whether the Sacrament of the Altar or the Eucharist be a sacrifice. In deciding which, it is to be observed that there exists no dispute between us and the Roman Catholics as to whether the Eucharist can be called a sacrifice, because it is admitted on both sides; but the question is whether it is a sacrifice properly so called—a "controversy about the method of speaking." "Both parties are agreed in this, namely that Christ is not slain anew in the Eucharist, but that He is present therein notwithstanding, and that His Body is truly eaten; that thus there is instituted a commemoration or representation of the sacrifice which was once offered for us on the Cross, but which cannot be again offered in the same manner." "If Protestants were satisfied to speak in unison with the Holy Fathers" like Jerome, who believes that sacrifices are offered in the New Covenant and in the Church, "I do not see anything remaining which should retard peace, as far as this point is concerned."

Other controversies of this class include—

Whether there be two or seven Sacraments? Whether an intention is requisite to the validity of a Sacrament? Whether sins are truly taken away by justification? Whether a Man can be sure of his justification and his final perseverance? Whether it be possible to fulfil the Law contained

in the Decalogue? Whether the good works of the just are in themselves perfectly good and free from all taint of sin? etc.

"Many other such controversies may be added, but these few will suffice as a specimen. For the adjustment of questions of this class there is no need of a new Council, General or Provincial; but merely that they be discussed by a few unprejudiced, learned and moderate Divines of both sides; and the different acceptation of the terms being seen, the matter can be brought to a conclusion without much trouble in the proposed conference."

(2) The second class consists of "questions controverted indeed but of such a character that the opposite opinions are tolerated in either of the Churches. In such instances, for the sake of peace, that opinion should be adopted on both sides which the entire body of one of the Churches and a portion of the other maintain."

On these terms Protestants are to approve of Prayers for the Dead, Catholics to give up the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M. On good works Protestants must accept the Catholic point of view, since many of their members hold it as Protestants, etc.

(3) "To the third class belong those questions at issue between us and the Catholics which cannot be decided either by the explanation of equivocal terms or by the condescension applicable to questions of the second class, inasmuch as the opinions of the parties appear to be diametrically opposite." Such are—

Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images and Relics, Transubstantiation, Purgatory, Number of Canonical Books, Judge in Controversies, Celebration of Mass in Latin, Primacy of Pontiff by Divine Right, the Marks of the Church, Indulgences, Monastic Vows, Council of Trent, Reading Holy Scripture in vernacular, etc., etc. It is probable that a part of these may be brought to a close without the aid of a Council, but the worst of them are as follows: Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, Worship of Images, Monastic Vows, Sacred Traditions, the Unwritten Word of God, Transubstantiation, the Primacy of the Pope and his infallibility.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION. "Roman Catholics are invited, for peace sake, in the proposed Convention to

reconsider the mode of Transubstantiation in the Eucharist, and to be satisfied to say with us that this mode is incomprehensible and inexplicable, but of such a character that, by means of some hidden and wonderful change, the bread becomes the Body of Christ; and, on the other hand, those Protestants to whom this may appear new must be invited to imitate the first Reformers in waiving all objections to such propositions as that the bread is the Body of Christ, the wine is the Blood of Christ; and to reflect besides that these properties were of old so universally considered true that scarce one of the early doctors of the Church is to be found who has not taken delight in these or similar explanations concerning the Eucharist."

On the Primacy of the Pope. If Dupin's conclusions in the 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th dissertations of his work "could meet the approval of the Ultramontane Catholics as they do that of the Protestants, I should say that the whole affair was settled, or at least that the Protestants fully agree with the French Church."

The Council. "Should anything remain undetermined by the arbitrators recourse must be had to a Council." The conditions of the summoning of the Council are as follows—

It must be summoned by the High Pontiff and be as general as conditions will allow. No appeal is to be made to the Council of Trent or to other Councils in which Protestant doctrines were put under anathema. The Pope is to submit to the Six Postulates by "a laudable condescension." Everything must be done according to the Canons, and only the Bishops must *vote*. But, before the celebration of the Council, the Pope "should confirm and recognise as true Bishops all Protestant Superintendents, who shall be summoned together with the Roman Catholic Bishops to this General Council, and shall sit and vote freely in the same, not as a party but co-ordinately with the Roman Catholic Bishops as competent judges." In such a Council the "Doctors will carry on the discussion, but the Bishops will make decrees by the plurality of votes." After the publication of the Canons both parties are bound to acquiesce in the decisions or to "suffer the penalties adjudged by the Canons."

Conclusion. "If the Sovereign Pontiff be willing and

able to grant to the Protestants these Six Postulates; if in the Imperial Congress the controversies of the first class, which regard the mode of speech, be decided; if in this Congress, in all controversies of the second class, each Church will embrace that doctrine which is held by a portion of its own members and by all the members of the other; if questions of the third class can be brought to a close either by modifications on the part of the arbitrators or by the decision of a General Council; it follows that a Reunion of the Protestant and Catholic Churches is possible without prejudice to the principles, hypotheses and reputation of either."

Written at Hanover in the months of Nov. and Dec. 1691 (scriptum Hanov. mense Novembris et Decembris 1691).

Œuvres de Bossuet, xvii. 394 ff.

N.B. *Œuvres de Bossuet*, XVII. 432–458. PROJET DE RÉUNION is really a French translation of the *Cogitationes Privatæ*. The work is abridged, but without taking away essentials. In this edition of Bossuet's work the *Cogitationes Privatæ* cover thirty-seven pages and the *Projet* twenty-six pages. The full title of the latter is: " Pensées particulières sur le moyen de réunir l'église protestante avec l'Église catholique romaine, proposées par un théologien sincèrement attaché à la Confession d'Augsbourg, sans préjudicier aux sentimens des autres, avec le consentement des supérieurs, et communiquées en particulier à M. l'Évêque de M. pour être examinées en la crainte de Dieu, à condition de n'être pas encore publiées."

III

THE *RÉFLEXIONS* OF BOSSUET

Réflexions de M. l'Évêque de Meaux sur l'Écrit de M. l'Abbé Molanus, April, May, June, July 1692. The reflexions of Bossuet on Molanus's great irenicon divide themselves into two parts. The first consists of a summary of the work itself, and the second of a clever criticism of it.

(1) The most important contribution of Molanus, according to Bossuet, is the manner in which controversial points are settled. "I see nothing in this pamphlet," the Bishop writes, "which is more essential and which more facilitates the cause of Reunion than the harmonising of our controversies . . . by the illustrious and wise author . . . if we follow the sentiments of Molanus, Reunion will follow, wholly or in part." Again, he is keen about showing that the essential articles, with which Molanus deals, are agreeable with the doctrine of the symbolical books as the Confession d'Augsbourg and its "Apologie" [written by Melanchthon and subscribed by all, including Luther], and the Little Confession of Luther. The rest of the first part of the *Réflexions* covers, in the form of a summary, the points treated by Molanus.

(2) His reflexions commence at p. 590 ("Réflexions sur le projet de notre auteur"). "The overtures are excellent in general," he begins. There is almost nothing to do but to change their order. "To tell the truth, it would appear very strange in Rome and all the Catholic Church that a beginning should not be made with those things which concern Faith." The preliminary union, of which the author speaks under six heads, is impracticable in this order ("tout cela est visiblement impracticable dans cet ordre"). Two different Creeds cannot be united; they cannot even tolerate each other.

The relation of Molanus to the decisions of previous

Councils, apart from the anathemas of the Council of Trent, cannot be accepted. Some of the questions of controversy were settled at the Councils of Nicæa (II), Lateran, and Lyons. "Our author finds no remedy except that the Pope should hold all these Councils . . . in suspense and be willing to receive into his Communion and into that of the Protestant Church those who make a profession of rejecting the decisions, and of holding doctrines contrary to those which have been determined."

Superintendents and pastors among the Protestants cannot be translated as Molanus desires. They are "mere laymen." Even if they agreed to submit to re-ordination, the first condition must be "that they have a Confession of Faith common to themselves and to those who ordain them."

One demand must take the place of the six proposed by Molanus. It is that all the decisions of all the Œcumenical Councils be accepted. Without this unique demand there is no stability of judgment possible. "If we hold these Councils in suspense because the Hussites, the Wycliffites, the Vaudois, the Berengarians, the Iconoclasts . . . are opposed to them, we shall be obliged to come to the decision that we must hold nothing as decided . . . which alone would destroy all the authority of ecclesiastical decisions." An Œcumenical Council so-called, which holds all previous Councils in suspense, destroys the authority of all such Councils and the majesty of the Church.

Some examples of true conciliation are given. At Lyons (II), under Gregory X, the Greeks were received into Communion, but only after having confessed, in an express declaration of faith, their agreement to all the articles of which they contested the truth, and "in particular the Supremacy of the Chair of Holy Peter and the Pope, as established by Jesus Christ." At Florence the Greeks were again received into Communion, but only after due and proper preparations. We see therefore by these examples that Reunion has always been firmly based on a preliminary agreement on matters of faith. On no other terms would it have been possible.

Special attention is paid to the Council of Basel, which was quoted by the Protestants as an ideal example. The Pope is said to have broken the Decrees of Constance and

to have allowed the Calixtines their claim for Communion in both kinds. Bossuet admits that the Church " semble avoir poussé le plus loin la condescendance " in this case. He tries to explain it away by describing the action of Basel as " un dessein de confirmer les catholiques dans la vérité décidé et de l'autre côté qu'une pieuse adresse pour attirer les errans au concile dans l'espérance qu'ils céderoient à l'autorité, à la charité et aux raisons d'une assemblée à laquelle ils reconnoissoient dans l'accord même que le Saint-Esprit présidoit."

The controversy over the Council of Trent is " la plus difficile (question) non en elle-même mais par rapport aux protestans." Some writers argue that France did not receive this Council. But there is ample evidence to prove that all the protestations of France, both during and after the Council, had no connection with the Faith but only concern " the prerogatives, liberties and customs of the kingdom " (préséances, prérogatives, libertés et coutumes du royaume).

Councils have sometimes also been received later, *e.g.* France did not receive the seventh Council at first, but did so later and has accepted the decisions of the Council ever since. The same thing may happen when the Protestants gain a clear understanding of the work of the Council of Trent.

Bossuet repeats his attack against the Protestant desire to cast aside the decisions of past Councils, where they appear false, and mentions his correspondence with Leibnitz on the subject, especially Leibnitz's letter dated 3 July 1692. He comes to the conclusion which he had given above. The decisions of a thousand years cannot be put aside, that would mean the destruction of the historic Church: " il anéantit tous les jugemens ecclésiastiques."

What is the reason for condemning past Councils as not œcumenical? Not because the Pope calls them, nor because he presides, nor because they are opposed to Scripture, but solely because all parties were not represented. Leibnitz desires a condescension to the Protestants equivalent to that shown to the Calixtines. The cases are entirely different. The Calixtines accepted the decrees of Constance; the Protestants are opposed to a hundred matters of faith.

The conclusion of the *Réflexions* is as follows—

"Le docte Abbé . . . si l'on change seulement l'ordre de son projet, a ouvert aux siens, comme il se l'étoit proposé, le chemin à la paix et comme le port du salut.

Un seul corps et un seul esprit, Eph. iv. 4.

Écrit à Meaux dans les mois d'avril, mai, juin, et juillet 1692."

Œuvres de Bossuet, xvii. 548 ff.

LEIBNITIANA WITH NOTES

A REVIEW of the chief collections of the works of Leibnitz and of the biographies and especially of works directly connected with his religious activities is of great interest and importance. It illustrates the difficulty of collecting the works of such a versatile author and of giving the right perspective to his work for the Reunion of the Church. Since theology is a subject which Leibnitz throws into his political, mathematical and philosophic works as well as into his more strictly religious works, it is necessary to take a broad survey of the whole field.

The Leibnitiana may be divided into three divisions: (1) Editions of the works of Leibnitz, (2) Panegyrics and biographies, (3) Literature on the religious activities of Leibnitz.

(1) EDITIONS OF HIS WORKS

The collection of Leibnitz's works was a long and difficult task. His propensity for the epistolary form and his love of anonymity, especially in his religious works, made it a considerable period before any comprehensive collection could be made. There could, however, be no true conception of the whole activities of Leibnitz until the preliminary gathering together of the sources had been made.

The early collections of FELLER (1718) and DESMAIZEAU (1719) contained extracts of his religious works.

1734–42. CHRISTIAN KORTHOLD. 4 vols. of letters to various people, but especially the 118 letters of the correspondence with Fabricius.

1747. CHRISTIAN KORTHOLD. Correspondence with Cuneau in *Berlinische Bibliothek*.

1753. Letters in the first volume of Bossuet's Works.

1760. Collection containing the correspondence with Huet.

1765. RASPE. Edition of the Philosophic Works.

1768. DUTENS, *Gothofredi Guillelmi Leibnitii Opera Omnia nunc Primum Collecta Studio Ludovici Dutens.* Geneva, 1768. The first volume (*Opera Theologica*) is of the utmost importance to our subject; of the remaining five volumes there are incidental notices, which must be dealt with. The whole six volumes contain the first really effective contribution to a general view of Leibnitz's work. Many of the letters have not yet passed into more recent works.

Some minor collections by LESSING (1770), *Boehmer's Magazine* (1787) and VECSENMEYER (1788), who edits the correspondence with Schmidt, the Professor at Helmstadt.

The great period of collecting the works of Leibnitz extends from 1838 to about 1880. The following most important contributions were made during that period.

1838–40. *Leibniz' Deutsche Schriften Herausgegeben*, von G. E. Guhrauer. 2 vols. Berlin. There is much new theological material here.

1840. J. E. ERDMANN, *God. Guil. Leibnitii Opera Philosophica quæ extant Latina, Gallica, Germanica, Omnia.* Berlin. A very fine edition, but incomplete in correspondence.

1843–45. G. H. PERTZ, *Leibnitzens Gesammelte Werke aus den Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Hannover Herausgegeben.*

1844. Correspondence with Malebranche in the *Journal des Savans.*

1846. O. A. JACQUES, *Œuvres de Leibniz.* Paris, 1846, 2 vols.

1846. GROTEFEND on the correspondence with the Landgrave Ernest and Arnauld in *Göttinger Gelehrten Anzeigen*, pp. 705 ff.

1847. G. H. PERTZ, *Geschichtliche Aufsätze und Gedichte.* Incomplete.

1847. CHR. VON ROMMEL, *Leibniz und Landgraf Ernst von Hessen-Rheinfels.* Frankfurt am Main.

1850. C. J. GERHARDT, *Leibnitzens Mathematische Schriften Herausgegeben*, von C. J. Gerhardt. 7 vols. London and Berlin, 1850; Halle, 1855–63.

1850. C. W. RUSSELL, *System of Theology.* A very useful introduction to the whole religious activities of the period :— Roman Catholic. (For other editions of the *Systema* see Chapter V.)

1854–65. Foucher de Careil published not less than ten great and small volumes of Leibnitz's writings, most of which were unpublished. The introductions and notes are of great value, but there are many errors. The religious and theological works entered on a second edition. The best edition is that of 7 vols. published at Paris, 1859–75, as—

Œuvres de Leibniz Publiées pour la Première fois d'Après les Manuscrits Originaux avec Notes et Introductions. Vols. 1 and 2 are Theological; vols. 3–6, Political; vol. 7, "L. et les Académies."

A volume by Foucher (1857, Paris) of *Nouvelles Lettres et Opuscules inédits*, which consists of his unpublished philosophic works. Foucher is of the utmost importance for the critical questions on the correspondence with Bossuet.

1864–77. Onno Klopp, *Die Werke von Leibniz gemäss Seinem Handschriftlichen Nachlasse in der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Hannover.* 10 vols. appeared at Hanover. These works are Historical and Political.

1875–82. C. J. Gerhardt, *Die Philosophischen Schriften von G. W. Leibniz.* Berlin. Contains valuable introductions.

1908. *Kritischer Katalog der Leibnitz-Handschriften zur Vorbereitung der Interacademischen Leibnitz-Ausgabe Unternommen.*

(2) Panegyrics and Biographies

The early biographies are based almost entirely on Eckhart. There are few other sources available, with the result that Leibnitz is a veiled personality for many years after his death.

J. G. Eckhart, Leibnitz's secretary and then his colleague in the Court at Hanover, wrote a MS. panegyric on Leibnitz, and boasted of his very confidential intercourse with his great friend. It was printed at last in 1779 as "Lebenslauf des Herrn von Leibnitz, zuerst im Originale abgedruckt," in von Murr's *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und allgemeinen Literatur*, VII, 1779. The work was "regarded by almost all 'literati' and historians of philosophy as an incontestable authority" (von fast allen Literatoren und Geschichtsschreibern wie eine unumstössliche Autorität respektirt wurden).—Guhrauer, I. xvi.

It is possible, however, to live with a great man for many years and to know less about him than those who have had the privilege of studying his works. Certain it is that they who trust Eckhart entirely have a one-sided view of Leibnitz.

1717. The "Elogium Leibnitii" in the *Acta Eruditorum* (probably by Chr. Wolff) is a repetition of Eckhart.

1717. *Éloge de Mr. G. G. Leibniz*, par Mr. de Fontenelle (Dutens, I. xix ff.). A clear and important analysis of Leibnitz's share in all departments of knowledge except theology and the Church. A well-arranged work, it adds little new knowledge to Eckhart.

1718. *Otium Hannoveranum*, J. F. Feller, with the *Supplementum Vitæ Leibnitianæ*, which add only a few literary notices.

1734. *Histoire de la vie et des Ouvrages de Mr. Leibniz*, par M. L. de Neufville (Joucourt). It appeared in the Amsterdam edition of the *Théodicée*, and contains more rhetoric than new knowledge.

1737. Karl Gunther Ludovici, *Ausführlicher Entwurf einer vollständigen Historie der Leibnitschen Philosophie*. 2 parts. It shows great industry but little criticism, and contains many inaccuracies. Dutens was helped by it, but there is no trace of a historical or critical point of view; in many places it is pedantic and poor. It is strange that Lessing, who did much during his last years on the Life, writings and Philosophy of Leibnitz, took no notice of Ludovici, though he made a chronological list of Biographies. Nor does Ludovici cite Joucourt.

1740. A worthless Life, by Lamprecht. This work arose from a curious discovery. Among the effects of the Duchess of Orleans, which fell into the hands of Frederick the Great, was the MS. of Eckhart. Frederick commanded Lamprecht to write from it. (An Italian translation of this work appeared at Rome, 1787, by Joseph Barsotti, with many precious notices, especially in relation to Leibnitz's stay at Rome, 1689.) Of course this work was useless after the publication of Eckhart.

1783. M. Hissmann (Professor at Göttingen), *Versuch über das Leben des Freiherrn von Leibniz*. Published at Munster, and attacks Wolff for the defacement of Leibnitz's philosophic principles.

1795. Eberhard, *G. W. Freiherr von Leibniz* in the

" Pantheon der Deutschen," II. 1795. This work was well received and much read. It had the advantage of the collections of Leibnitiana made up to that date, and took first place in Germany for a considerable period. But there is a good deal of rhetoric in it. Guhrauer learned something from it, as the following notice shows.

" Undankbar wäre ich jedoch, wenn ich nicht bemerkte, dass ich gleichwohl Eberharden die Entdeckung des wahren, aber ehedem nie geahnten Grundes der Reise Leibnitzens nach Paris im Jahre 1672—nemlich seine Sendung an den französischen Hof, auf den Wunsch Ludwigs XIV, wegen des Vorschlags einer Expedition nach Ægypten—verdanke." He gives the document, by which Leibnitz was invited, from the hand of Arnaud de Pomponne, in the name of " le grand Monarque."

1842 and 1846. G. E. Guhrauer, *G. W. Freiherr von Leibnitz* (2 vols. : Breslau). This work is the first thorough and comprehensive critical study of Leibnitz. Pichler declares (I. vi) that Guhrauer first gave Germany a true picture of one of her most penetrating thinkers (welcher das deutsche Volk mit dem umfassendsten seiner Geister erst recht bekannt gemacht hat). Before the publication of this work Leibnitz was a shadow and not a reality to Germany. The very helpful " Anmerkungen und Urkunden," which serve as an Appendix, are most valuable. Guhrauer gives the following account of them : " In den Anmerkungen und Urkunden hinter dem Texte findet man über meine gedruckten, wie ungedruckten Quellen, welche letztere ich grossentheils den Schätzen der königlichen Bibliotheken von Hannover, Paris, London, Frankfurt am Main, und Wolfenbüttel verdanke, nähere Rechenschaft " (I. xxiii).

Much material has been discovered since the days of Guhrauer, and especially on the religious side of Leibnitz's work. Guhrauer fails to give a correct estimate of the correspondence with Bossuet. In the words of Pichler, " Die Haltung Leibnitzens in der Correspondenz mit Bossuet durchaus falsch zum Nachtheile des ersteren beurtheilt worden " (I. 181). Guhrauer also fails to give a correct idea of the relation between the religious and philosophic ideas of Leibnitz.

The book lacks references throughout, and is spoiled by

the omission of any Bibliography whatsoever. But it is a great work and begins a new epoch for the clearer understanding of Leibnitz.

1884. J. T. MERZ, *Leibniz* (Blackwoods' Philosophical Classics). London. A useful introduction to the whole work of Leibnitz. The perspective of his various activities is well kept throughout, but it is quite elementary, and on the subject of Church unity has very little to contribute.

1909. BARUZI, *Leibniz*.

1921. There is an important work by SCHMALENBACH, München, but I have been unable to procure a copy.

(3) LITERATURE ON THE RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES OF LEIBNITZ

The theological and ecclesiastical or rather religious side of Leibnitz's work was a considerable time before it became the subject of scholarship. Germany was frightened of dealing with the doctrine and work of such a heretic, who offended Roman Catholics and Protestants alike by his independent spirit. He stood outside all the Churches. The Roman Catholics had no sympathy as a rule with one whom Bossuet had failed to convert. Eusebius Amort (1730) ridicules the System of the Pre-established Harmony as "dignum risu," a system unworthy of a detailed refutation,[1] and which no man of sound understanding could fail to undermine in its many errors. Two letters of Leibnitz printed in the first volume (1753) of Bossuet's works need a direct apology to the Catholic public and to the Roman theologians in particular. But they are printed, the editor says, to show how the blows of the enemies of Catholicism rebound from the rocks of true Catholicity.[2]

The Orthodox Protestants, following the false judgments of Pfaff and Mosheim, blamed Leibnitz for his indifference. Lessing was severe on his countryman. He said: "The philosophy of Leibnitz is very little known, but his theology is less known."[3] Leibnitz experienced the truth of his

[1] *Philosophia Pollingana*, p. 737; Pichler, I. 172.
[2] Preface, p. xxv., "Œuvres de Bossuet," Vol. I.; Pichler, p. 172.
[3] "Die Philosophie des Leibniz ist sehr wenig bekannt, aber seine Theologie ist es weniger" (Pichler, p. 172).

own remark as a young man of twenty-four years. "Sola omnium regionum Germania in præclaris suorummet agrorum germinibus agnoscendis et ad immortalitatem propagandis stupida et obliviscitur ipsa sui ac suorum nisi ab exteris de propriis opibus admoneatur" (Dutens, V. 349).

Diderot formally challenged the Germans in the Encyclopedia (1765) (*Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné*, IX. 379*b*) to carry out at last the collection of the works of the man to whom Germany owed so much, "as Greece to its Plato, Aristotle and Archimedes; to a man who had perhaps read, studied, meditated, and written more than any other man at any time" ("als Griechenland seinem Platon, Aristoteles und Archimedes miteinander, einem Manne, der vielleicht mehr gelesen, mehr studirt, mehr meditirt und mehr geschrieben habe, als je ein anderer Mensch," Pichler's trans., I. 173). In 1768 the Academy of Berlin offered a prize for an exposition of the philosophical and theological principles of Leibnitz, but it was a Frenchman who won it [1] (S. Bailly, *b.* 1736, and Mayor of Paris at the beginning of the Revolution, an astronomer and first President of the States General, who devoted himself later to his studies. He wrote *Mémoires d'un témoin de la Révolution*, and was executed 10 Nov. 1793, under circumstances of aggravated cruelty). But how poor a work! Leibnitz's important work *Essais sur l'entendement humain*, published only three years before, was unknown to the writer. It is painful to hear the Frenchman address the Berlin Academy, the child of Leibnitz, in words which show that Germany had not risen to her national calling.

There was nothing further on the religious activities of Leibnitz until the Roman Catholic writers became busy.

1808. TABARAUD, *Histoire des Projets pour la Réunion des Communions Chrétiennes*. Tabaraud was a French Oratorian and has the distinction of being the first writer to limit his study to the efforts for Church unity. His work is prejudiced throughout in favour of Bossuet and the Roman Church in France, against Leibnitz and German Protestantism. There is no trace of an understanding of Leibnitz's theology.

1815. Benedictine Abbot PRETCHL gave a short exposi-

[1] By his "Éloge de Leibniz, qui a remporté le prix de l'Académie royale," par Bailly, Berlin, 1768.

tion of the efforts of Leibnitz for Church unity. But again there are many invectives against Leibnitz and prejudice on the side of Rome.

1819. The attack of Rome took another direction. Leibnitz was no longer a bold Protestant but a mild Catholic, and his *Systema* was published as his Testament. The result was a new and active interest in the man.

1820. DOLLER the Jesuit expressed the Roman view in the Introduction to the *Systema* edited by Räss and Weiss [" Leibnitzens System der Theologie nach dem MS. von Hannover (den lateinischen Text zur Seite) ins Deutsche übersetzt," von Dr. Räss und Dr. Weiss].

Answers came from the Protestant side as follows—

1827. SCHULZ, *Ueber die Entdeckung dass L. ein Katholik Gewesen sei*, proved that Leibnitz was not a Roman Catholic. Göttingen.

1836–38. HERING, *Geschichte der Kirchlichen Unionsversuche seit der Reformation bis auf Unsere Zeit.* Leipzig, II. 232 ff. He limits himself almost entirely to the correspondence with Bossuet.

1836. STAUDENMAIER, *Leibniz über Gottliche Offenbarung* (in " Tübingen Quartal-Schrift," Jahr. 1836, S. 256). He shows that Leibnitz was a sincere Christian but not a Roman Catholic, but he vitiates his argument by thinking that the *Systema* is the fixed and only summary of Leibnitz's theology, and limits himself entirely to this source.

1838. THOLUCK (in *Vermischte Schriften*, Hamburg, 1839, I. 312 ff.) apologises for Leibnitz against the reproach that he was indifferent to religion.

1840 begins the great era for Leibnitz as a theologian and worker for Church unity.

1841. GUHRAUER in Lessing's *Erziehung des Menschengeschlectes beleuchtet* (Berlin), p. 58 ff., gave a short account of Leibnitz's theology.

1846. GUHRAUER in his *Biographie* gives a splendid account of Leibnitz's relations to the Churches, on which nearly all later accounts are based, at least, for a considerable period. Many authors try to appear independent, but the great work of Guhrauer is patent at every point, *e.g.* in the article on " Leibnitz " in Wagener's *Staatslexicon*, Bd. VI.

Much new matter has come to hand since Guhrauer wrote, although Guhrauer himself improved his position by an

account in the Stuttgart German Quarterly, 1847. *For thirty years after the work of Guhrauer scholars took up the Church Unity efforts of Leibnitz with great avidity. The best works came from the Protestant side and from laymen as well as from theologians.*

1844. O. G. SCHMIDT, *Pericula Conjugendarum Ecclesiarum a Leibnitio facta.* Grimæ, 1844. This was a prize essay, in which every available source up to that time was used.

1846. G. H. PERTZ, an essay on the "Glaubensbekenntniss" of Leibnitz in the *Allg. Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, Bd. VI, 65 ff.; also printed separately. A good account of Leibnitz's theology, in which some of Guhrauer's errors are corrected.

1847. CHR. ROMMEL gives a good account of the theology and unity efforts of Leibnitz in the introduction to his work (see above).

1855. SCHENKEL, *Der Unionsberuf des Evangelischen Protestantismus*, Heidelberg, 1855, pp. 467 ff., limits himself to the discussion of unity efforts.

1860. JULIAN SCHMIDT did something in *Granzbote*, 44, 45.

1861. ONNO KLOPP, *Das Verhältniss von Leibniz zu den Kirchlichen Reunionsversuchen.* Hanover.

1862. BOGEN, *Rom und Hannover*, in the "Zeitschrift für historische Theologie," pp. 239 ff.

1862–64. KUNO FISCHER in *Geschichte der Neueren Philosophie*, II. 256. Fischer adds little new material, and shows his ignorance by not mentioning the great work of Foucher published a few years before, and repeating the old error that Leibnitz broke off the correspondence with Bossuet when Foucher had discovered the final letter in the handwriting of Leibnitz.

1864. KARL ROSENKRANZ writes a very good article in Rotteck's *Staatslexicon*, Bd. 9, which is much the best of such articles on the subject.

The Roman Catholic writers were now baffled by the immense labours of the Protestants, who had proved conclusively that Leibnitz was not a Roman Catholic, so that they took up the attitude of scorn, disgust, or, at best, pity for him.

1863. LUDWIG CLARUS, *Wanderungen und Heimkehr eines Christlichen Forschers*, III. 64. Schaffhausen.

1864. PROFESSOR HAFFNER wrote in the Catholic Journal at Mainz, 1864. The sort of Catholic opinion of the times is well illustrated by a sentence from this writer. "The greatest of German minds remains but a foreigner in German

development. The work of the great man is stamped by the curse which hangs over all minds which will not give a full confession of the truth which they perceive," p. 611.

1864. C. J. HEFELE, *Die Unionsverhandlungen am Ende des 17 Jahrhundert und Leibnitzens Theilnahme an Denselben.* Tübingen. Even Hefele was ignorant of Foucher's work.

1865. WERNER, *Geschichte der Apologetischen und Polemischen Literatur*, Bd. IV, 761 ff. Schaffhausen, 1865.

With these German theologians of the Roman School it is interesting to compare the French Roman theologians. *The former looked on Leibnitz as a foreigner who had refused to follow Christian truth because he had no true religious motive in his heart. The latter, like Foucher de Careil, the Jesuit P. Ramiere, and Bishop Dupanloup, regarded Leibnitz as a keenly religious man, with whom no other scholar of the times could hold his own;* in the words of Dupanloup : " a scholar, in comparison with whom our modern scholars, if their pride does not blind them, must appear very small."

1869. A. PICHLER, *Die Theologie des Leibniz.* 2 vols. München. This work is the most thorough treatment of the subject up to the present time. The author recognises the danger of his subject. He is bound to approach it in the true unprejudiced spirit of Leibnitz himself, with the result that he stands in danger of irritating both Protestants and Catholics " and at some future time of being buried, like Leibnitz, without respect " (und zuletzt nicht einmal anständig begraben zu werden, wie es Leibniz gegangen ist), I. 180. He knows also the critical problems which surround the whole subject, and he has used every available source in order to meet them. Hagenbach wrote of him, in 1871 : " ein neuerer Schriftsteller dem wir das meiste Licht über Leibnitz als Theologen verdanken," pp. 479, 480. After reading the volumes carefully through, one feels overwhelmed by the vast researches that have been made into every department of Leibnitz's thought. It is more a source book of Leibnitz's theology than a clear exposition of it. Much more might have been made of the extremely useful first volume of Dutens, and the reader's patience is severely tried by the lack of a bibliography and of an index. In such a work an index is imperative.

In addition to the above-named works, mention must be made of the following :

BIEDERMANN, *Deutschland in* 18 *Jahrhund.* (Vol. II, chapter 6).
BOSSUET, J. B. *Œuvres complètes de Bossuet* (esp. Vol. 17). Paris, 1867.
BULAEUS, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* (Vols. IV and V). Paris, 1668 ff.
Cambridge Modern History (Vols. IV and V).
GARDINER, S. R. *The Thirty Years' War.* London, 1912.
GERSON, J. C. *Opera*, edit. ELLIES DU PIN. Antwerp, 1706.
GUIDELY, A. *History of the Thirty Years' War* (trans. A. T. Brook). London, 1885.
HAGENBACH, K. R. *Kirchengeschichte*, V. Leipzig, 1871 (3rd edit.).
HENDERSON, E. F. *A Short History of Germany.* London, 1910.
JERVIS, W. H. *A History of the Church in France.* London, 1872.
LEAR, H. F. *Bossuet and His Contemporaries.* London, 1880.
LUPTON, J. H. *Archbishop Wake and the Project of Union* (1717–1720). London, 1896.
MENZEL, *Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen.*
PLUMMER, A. *The Continental Reformation.*
SCHLEGEL, *Kirchengeschichte der Hannoverischen Staaten.*
SLEIGH, R. S. *The Sufficiency of Christianity.* London, 1923.
TROELTSCH, E. *Gesammelte Schriften*, I., II. and III. Tübingen, 1919 ff.

See also *New World*, V. 102–122, 1896, "Leibniz and Protestant Theology." *Dublin Review*, X. 394–429, 1841, "Leibniz and the Catholic Church."

INDEX

RECENTLY PUBLISHED

THE INQUISITION

From the Establishment
to the Great Schism

BY

A. L. MAYCOCK, M.A.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

FATHER RONALD KNOX

Spectator: "Mr. Maycock's book on the Inquisition is peculiarly interesting because it treats the subject historically and on the whole dispassionately. . . . He shows greater wisdom in stating the facts and avoiding theological controversy."

Catholic Times: "This book is the best book we have in English on the subject within the limits assigned in the title . . . it is sympathetic and written out of a full knowledge. The book sets in front of us, hiding nothing, the origins, establishment, history and practice of the famous institution."

Daily Telegraph: "The author, a Catholic apologist, has followed Acton by respecting the rules of impartiality. He does not shirk the horrors that confront him. . . . What he does do worthily is to try and show the workings of the mediæval mind. . . . He has compressed into the compass of a readable volume an enormous mass of research."

Universe: "Mr. Maycock is to be congratulated upon a judicial, penetrating and well-documented historical work. . . . We have nothing but praise to express for the author's sense of proportion, which is the outstanding characteristic of the book."

Outlook: "In this extremely interesting study . . . Mr. Maycock has analysed with great thoroughness the historical soil out of which this important Christian institution sprang, and shows very clearly how natural, and even necessary, a growth it was. . . . It is refreshing to come upon an historian working with so scrupulous a sense of moral and historical values."

CONSTABLE LONDON W.C.2

OTHER RELIGIOUS WORKS

THE MAN NOBODY KNOWS

BY BRUCE BARTON

(*28th Thousand*).

THE BOOK NOBODY KNOWS

BY BRUCE BARTON

(*16th Thousand*).

Perhaps the two most successful presentments of the modern attitude towards Christianity that have been offered during the last twenty-five years.

CAN THESE BONES LIVE?

A plea for a greater vigour and reality in the life of the Church of England

BY J. WORSLEY BODEN

WITH A PREFACE BY

REV. G. A. STUDDERT KENNEDY

RELIGIOUS ASSENT

A Discussion of the meaning and ground of its certainty

BY DOM MARK PONTIFEX

Of Downside Abbey.

WESTERN MYSTICISM

BY DOM CUTHBERT BUTLER

New Edition with "Afterthoughts."

CONSTABLE LONDON W.C.2

19 Rise of Brandt as a Work pro pulv Calx
Saint segal Comes Due to B
9/11 1671 Date of its appearance

p 41 Mentions Chapingolis Chapelain - Mc Ollas
Spelman Schedia Vita is no source!

p 42 L. heard a Great parte from Calcutta
L Schultz = J L. at Natural
Ha Calcutta :)

p 42, 66 Purchas

p 99 Gain of the Work
by the Watchmen of Re-Union
" Spanish relaciones. the motive

p. 188 Episcopacy essential Laws