Continental side of the Channel, and informed that he would not be permitted to land on the English coast. The free cities of the empire also refused the summons, as did five of the Swiss cantons ; and even a large number of Roman Catholic prelates, while professing unqualified obedience to the pope’s commands, showed much unwilling­ness to act upon them, and pleaded age, illness, or dio­cesan business as excuses for absenting themselves from the council. In this unpromising posture of affairs the preparations for the council were pressed on, and Cardinals Ercole Gonzaga, bishop of Mantua, Seripando, Hosius, Simoneta, and (later on) Altemps, the pope’s nephew, were named as legates, being directed to open the session of the council upon Easter Day, April 6, 1561. But they did not even arrive in Trent until April 16, and found no more than nine bishops awaiting them. Several causes conduced to this disappointment : the king of Spain had not yet accepted the bull convoking the council ; the French bishops were more than fully occupied with the rapid advances of the Reformation in their midst ; and the Germans had no great inclination for the repetition of their experience ten years before. It was thus necessary to postpone the assemblage till January 1 and then to January 18, 1562. That there might be a sufficient number of Italian bishops present to outvote any possible combination of others, the pope collected a large number of prelates, appointed them salaries for maintenance, and sent them off to Trent. Two questions of the highest practical importance came up for discussion in the pre­liminary congregation, wherein ninety-two bishops were present:—(1) Was the council to be styled a “continua­tion ” of the previous one, or to be reckoned as a new synod ? (2) Should the unprecedented clause in the papal decree for opening the council (but not found in the bull of convocation), “ proponentibus legatis ac præsidentibus,” be accepted and acted on, or rescinded ? To declare the council a “ continuation ” of its precursor was to accept and ratify all which had been done therein ; to treat it as a new one was to make every decree of the earlier sessions merely provisional and alterable. To adopt the novel clause embodied in the papal decree was to gag the council from the outset and deprive it of freedom by concentrat­ing the initiative in the hands of the legates ; and Guerrero, archbishop of Granada, pressed this objection with much urgency. On the other hand, this same prelate, acting on the orders of Philip II., demanded that the council should be plainly declared a continuation of its precursor, for Philip had already introduced some of the regulations of that synod into his dominions, and would lose credit if they were rescinded, or even treated as lacking full sanction. Contrariwise, the bishops of other nations present held that there was no prospect of inducing the Germans, English, and other partly alienated nationalities to send representatives, unless the proceedings so far should be regarded as capable of reconsideration and alteration at the hands of the actual assembly. The authorities at Rome were not unprepared for some difficulty on this head, and had endeavoured to evade it by using the indeterminate word “ celebrated,” which might be taken either way, and the Spanish remonstrants were privately told that it was understood that business should be taken up just where it had left off under Julius III., thus making the synod a continuation of the former one, but that any express statement to that effect had been carefully avoided, lest the Protestants should take offence, and thus one aim of the council might be defeated. The Spaniards were partly contented with this reply, but urged that nothing which could be interpreted as the convocation of a new council should be suffered to appear in the wording of the decree about to be publicly read, which was conceded.

The seventeenth session was held (January 18, 1562) in the presence of the legates,—106 bishops, 4 abbots, 4 generals of orders, and the duke of Mantua, nephew of the chief legate, being present. Four Spanish bishops lodged a protest against the proposing clause —two of them unreservedly, two in a more qualified manner—and they particularly objected to the novelty of the clause, and to the manner in which it had been sprung upon the council, the arch­bishop of Granada and the bishop of Orense pointing out that it was not in the original bull, with which the subsequent decree ought to be in complete agreement, and the former adding that it was not even in the copy of the decree shown to him. But the Italian majority was too strong, and the protest was overruled,— the prorogation of the council to February 26, 1562, being the only further business transacted. But a very important question was laid before the congregations which followed this session, that of providing some remedy for the injury done to the Roman Catholic Church by the circulation of more or less hostile books, a difficulty made incomparably greater from the middle of the 15th century onwards than at any previous time in history, by reason of the invention of printing. The council of Lateran in 1515 had made a licence from the ecclesiastical authorities requisite before any book could be printed, under pain of excommunication, but this penalty did not affect Protestant printers, and the issue of a catalogue of books forbidden to Catholics became a necessary addi­tion. Such a catalogue was issued by Paul IV. in 1559, but some machinery for supplementing it as fresh books poured from the press could alone meet the permanent danger. Another matter debated in these congregations was the invitation of Protestants to attend, and in what character. In the eighteenth session (February 26, 1562) two decrees on these subjects were promulgated,—one appointing a committee to report to the council on the whole question of heretical books ; the other publishing a safe-conduct to the German Protestants, extended by a rider to those of other nations. The congregations held after this session were busied chiefly with the questions of residence and the abuse of indulgences, besides several less important details of reform. A warm debate arose as to the nature of the obligation to reside,—the Spaniards holding it to be of divine right, the Italians to be of no more than ecclesiastical precept. So powerful a body in the council took the Spanish view that the legates were alarmed, especially as ominous speeches were made to the effect that the Roman curia must be re­formed on the basis of the report of cardinals to Paul III. before anything of moment could be done in the way of real improvement. Accordingly, they sent a messenger to the pope, bringing with him a schedule of the proposed reforms, and asking for advice in the crisis. The pope desired them to counteract the opposition bishops, to postpone the question of residence, if they could not suppress it altogether, and despatched Visconti, bishop of Ventimiglia, as extra nuncio to the council, to report accurately to him everything said or done there, and with him sent also all the bishops who could be collected at Rome to swell the Italian vote, and thus defeat the opposition indirectly. There was much debate also on the scope of the safe-conduct, as the Spaniards were anxious that it should not protect those against whom the Inquisition had taken action, while others desired to see its terms enlarged sufficiently to meet the requirements of the Protestants, who objected to its suspicious silence on several weighty particulars. As the French ambassadors were expected, nothing was done in the nineteenth session (May 14, 1562) save to prorogue the council. On May 26, 1652, De Lanssac (who had been lately French envoy at Rome), Du Ferrier, and De Pibrac, envoys from Charles IX., were ad­mitted to audience, and demanded, amongst other matters, that the council should be formally declared a new one, wherein the imperial ambassadors supported them, while Philip II. of Spain, contrariwise, insisted that it should be declared a continuation of the former synod. The legates strove to satisfy both parties, and received contradictory directions from Rome, at first ordering them to announce the continuation of the former council, and afterwards leaving the matter to their discretion. So little agreement could be arrived at that the twentieth session (June 4, 1562) was held merely to prorogue the council. The question of communion in both kinds was the next to come up for consideration. It was such a capital one, if any hope of winning back the Protestants was to be entertained, that the imperial and French ambassadors had special injunctions to forward by all means in their power an affirmative decision. The Frenchmen saw little prospect of carry­ing this matter in the temper of the Italian majority, and were for opposing the discussion which the legates had announced, but the imperial ambassadors were more hopeful, and persuaded them to give way. While the question was being debated in the con­gregations, the Venetian and Bavarian ambassadors arrived, the latter armed with a formidable schedule of complaints against pre­valent abuses, and of demands for correspondingly drastic reforms, beginning with the pope and the curia, and making havoc amongst cardinals, dispensations, exemptions, pluralities, office-books, ex­clusively Latin services, and other like matters, thus threatening all manner of vested interests and long-rooted customs. The