This is lecture 6—The Catholic Reformation. Greetings once again in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and let me invite you to join me in prayer as we begin. Let us pray. Good and gracious Lord, we ask that you would guide us by your Spirit as we study together today. Open our minds to those things which you want to teach us. For Christ’s sake. Amen.

I’d like for us to focus our attention today on the Catholic Reformation, what is also called the Counter Reformation. Both designations are applicable, although the first tends to be used more frequently by Roman Catholics and the latter by Protestants. The Catholic Church, in fact, did undergo a genuine reform, which perhaps would have worked itself out one way or the other, even without the stimulus of Protestantism in the sixteenth century. There was the rise of Christian piety among many of the secular, as well as the regular clergy. There was a renewal of spirituality among lay people as well. Many of these were rooted in monastic or mystic traditions in the Middle Ages.

In addition to this, many of the decisions of the Counter Reformation, the measures it adopted and so on, were shaped to the need of responding explicitly to the Protestant challenge. It was caused by the defection of roughly half of Europe’s Christian communities. This is where the counter activity, aimed at the elimination of Protestantism, came to be of central importance.

We have a great number of good resources available to us as we study Catholic Reformation thought. Professor Janelle’s The Catholic Reformation, Bruce Publishing Company, 1941, is one possible source. Or H. J. Schroeder’s The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, Hooter and Company, 1941. Or H. Outram Evennett’s The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation, University of Notre Dame Press, 1970. Those of you who are following along in our text in Latourette will want to look especially at pages 840 to 883. These and other sources are very helpful to us, and I’ll be
After Lutheranism had been established in Germany, Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor, in the interest of German unity, tried to persuade the pope to assemble a true and adequately empowered council, so that the removal of abuses in the church could take place. It would undermine the very grounds upon which many Germans were turning to Lutheranism, and he hoped would cause them to return to the Roman Catholic Church. Francis I, however, the king of France at this time, put pressures on the pope not to call such a council, because it was in his political interest to retain some turmoil in those countries that were overseen by Charles V, the Holy Roman Emperor. Charles V, you see, had a kind of loose rule, at least in theory, over Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, and parts of Italy, those countries which encircle France. The pope for his part feared that Francis would withdraw the French church as Henry VIII had done in England, so he didn’t want to offend him.

Gradually, however, in the papal curia, there arose a party of reforming cardinals who concluded that the need of reform was so urgent that all dangers of a council must be risked. After a few aborted attempts, a council did meet at Trent on the Alpine borders of Germany and Italy. And the Council of Trent, which met irregularly between 1545 and 1547, again in 1551–1552, and finally in 1562 and 1563, helped to shape the destiny of much of modern Catholicism. We’re going in a later lecture picking up some of the aftermath of that famous council, and in fact, we’ll have a chance to look more particularly at the creed which emerged out of the Council of Trent, what is often called the Creed of the Council of Trent, a very central document in the life of the church.

Let me for today focus primarily upon some of the emerging realities which came out of that council, which feed into our understanding of the Catholic Reformation, or as some call it the Counter Reformation. The Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, the Council of Constance of 1415, and many others had very broad representation in the church. Those particular councils had more than five hundred prelates present. The Council of Trent in contrast, however, sometimes fell in membership below twenty. In fact, on the important issue of justification, the church’s decree was passed at a session where only sixty church leaders were present. The most regular in attendance were the Italians and the Spanish. The French and Germans were erratic at best in their membership and attention to the council, and they came only in small numbers.
The conciliar issue seemed to be at the heart of the discussions. A party within the church believed that the bishops of the Catholic Church, when assembled in council from all parts of the Catholic world, collectively constituted an authority superior to that of the pope. The pope for his part wanted to stave off this movement. You can understand why. The movement itself was strongest within France, and to some degree Germany. In fact, in 1551, the French king announced that France did not consider itself bound by the council, and Emperor Ferdinand, successor to Charles V, asked the council in 1562 to reassert the supremacy of council over pope. In the end, however, the pope won the day through a final ruling at the council that no act of the council can be valid unless it is accepted formally by the pope.

It’s possible that if the conciliar theory had won out in the midst of these battles, the Catholic Church might have become just as disunited in modern times as is the Protestant Church. It’s one of those “what if” questions that so intrigues historians. Thus Trent’s victory of centralized authority in the pope is of vital importance. The Council of Trent marks an important step in the movement in which three hundred years later would issue in the promulgation of the major finding of the First Vatican Council, the teaching that the pope has infallible or irreformable teaching authority in matters of faith and morals within certain clearly defined limits.

After 1563, no council met at all until this First Vatican Council of 1870, at which papal infallibility was proclaimed. Thus Trent preserved the international authoritative character of Roman Catholicism and helped prevent its dissolution into state churches, the kind of dissolution which they saw so rampant among the Protestant bodies.

The Council of Trent addressed two different kinds of issues. They were concerned about doctrine on the one side and upon reform of abuse in the church on the other. By the time the council convened in 1545, any possibility of reconciliation with Protestants seemed to be virtually gone. Protestants, especially Calvinists, simply didn’t wish to belong to the Church of Rome under any circumstances, no matter what reforms they brought about. For their part, the Roman Catholic Church through the Council of Trent was not willing to make many concessions either. Look at what the [council] determined on doctrine. Let me just mention a few . . .in list form.
Doctrinally Trent declared justification to be by works and faith combined, part of that classic stress of the early or medieval teaching. It enumerated seven sacraments, defining them exactly. It reaffirmed transubstantiation. It declared the priesthood to be a special state set apart from the laity by the sacrament of holy orders. As sources of the Catholic faith, the council put tradition and Scripture on an equal footing, thus rejecting the Protestant claim to *sola Scriptura*. This has had an ongoing, interesting debate in the church, and we’ll pick that story up later on when we talk about modern Catholicism, especially as it relates to the Second Vatican Council, which has in recent days transformed Roman Catholicism.

Trent also reaffirmed the validity of church development since New Testament times. It established the Vulgate, the translation into Latin made by Saint Jerome, you will recall, in the fourth century, as the authoritative teaching foundation for all teaching in the church. The right of individuals to believe their own interpretation of Scripture was denied; that is, they eliminated any tendency toward private judgment in handling of the Scriptures. Latin as opposed to the national languages was prescribed as the language of religious worship, and this was to continue right down to Vatican II. Celibacy of clergy was maintained; monasticism was upheld; the existence of purgatory was reaffirmed. The Theory of Correct Practice and the grant of indulgences were reinstated. The veneration of saints, the belief in the Virgin, the use of images, relics, and pilgrimages were approved as spiritually useful, and so on. Those very interesting theological developments were at the core of what Trent was about, but it was also interested in reform.

The council had enormous impact on monastic reform. It acted against the abuse of indulgences while upholding it in principle. Also it ruled that bishops should reside in their own diocesan regions and attend more carefully to their proper duties as the leaders of those churches. This was a reform that was very sorely needed. It gave bishops more administrative control over clergy in their diocese, such as mendicant friars who in the past had been exempt from this kind of episcopal jurisdiction, or at least had to function as if they were exempt.

Pluralism was discouraged; that is, the practice whereby one person held numerous church offices so they could make a lot more money and they held them concurrently. Measures were also taken to ensure that the church officials would be competent. The council ordered, in fact, to provide educated clergy; that a
seminary should be set up in each diocese for the training of priests. Laws have very little force unless they’re sustained by popular opinion, but there seemed to be in the Roman Catholic Church in this period a growing interest in reform. Protestants often overlook that, seeing the Catholic response to Protestant growth as only a negative one. We need also to come to recognize that there was a positive impetus toward genuine reform within the church as well.

The line of Renaissance popes was replaced, for example, by a line of what are called Reformed popes, the first of whom was Paul III, who in the mid-sixteenth century insisted upon strong moral leadership of the clergy, the stress upon holy living. And he also stressed missionary activity. In fact, in some ways, Roman Catholic missionary outreach was even more vigorous than Protestant outreach in the sixteenth century, at least among the Magisterial Reformers. Their attempt was in part to reconvert Protestants who had left the church. But there was also a great interest in missions among the poor and the needy and those who hadn’t heard the gospel. An example of this is St. Vincent De Paul and the work which he did along with his colleagues among the poor in Paris.

Much of this spirit developed in Spain, where the Renaissance had never taken hold very strongly. In fact, it was Spain that gave birth to one of the most fascinating figures of this time. Saint Ignatius Loyola, that’s a name that I think all of you should know, at least be familiar with, born in 1491; he died in 1556. Now you’ll notice that date—1491. Five hundred years marked the anniversary of that in 1991, and many of the Jesuit schools who are followers of Ignatius Loyola and his teaching are already well along in their plans for celebrations to mark this birthdate, this very special birthday of Loyola.

A soldier in youth, like Luther and Calvin he had a remarkable religious conversion which occurred in 1521. This came as a result of reading of the life of Christ in Scripture. He resolved to become a soldier of the church. He established on this principle the Society of Jesus, what is often called the Jesuit movement. This was authorized by Pope Paul III in 1540. The Jesuits became a monastic order of a new type, less attached to the cloister and moving much more actively into activity within the world. Each candidate had to undergo an arduous and even somewhat horrifying training set forth by Loyola in his *Spiritual Exercises*, and that is available in reprinted form in a number of our bookstores.
and certainly in our libraries, and some of you may want to pull that out and read that document. It’s a fascinating document. The order was ruled by a kind of iron discipline, which required each member in his immediate superior the absolute infallibility which they saw in the church. This was absolute obedience without question. These were to be soldiers for the faith, and they needed to be disciplined. They needed to obey without question.

The full-fledged Jesuit took an oath. This was an oath of obedience not only to the pope but also to the church. In the latter sessions of Trent, this group was instrumental in pushing the policy toward the primacy of the papacy against the conciliar movement and the conciliar forces. This high papalism came to be called Ultramontanism, and we’ll see that later on picked up in some of the very intense debates which went on between the pro-pope and pro-council forces.

By 1560, the Catholic Church devised also the practical machinery for a counter-offensive against Protestantism, and the Jesuits acted as a kind of international missionary force to promote that. Some of the most interesting conflicts between Protestants and Catholics in the subsequent years were between Jesuits and Protestant forces. The Jesuits poured into the most hotly disputed regions where the religious issue was still in the balance—France, Germany, Bohemia, Poland, Hungary—and they were successful in many of these areas, bringing many of the early converts to Protestantism back into the Roman Catholic fold. Especially now, were they able to do this since a number of reforms had taken place and the very things that pushed people out of the church now seemed to be remedied in sufficient degree so that they could return to the church once again.

This led to a whole series of continuing wars of religion; for example, the famous Thirty Years’ War from 1618 to 1648. Most often the Jesuits tried to bring people back into the fold through persuasion, but when this didn’t work, tougher measures were used. For example, virtually all countries encouraged often by the Jesuits censored books. Protestants for their part labored to keep what they called papace or papal works from the eyes of the faithful. Roman Catholic authorities for their part took the same pains against the heretics, those outside the church. Many of the bishops—Anglican, Lutheran, Catholic, and others—regulated reading matter within their parishes. The pope also produced an aid for this purpose, the so-called *Index of Prohibited Books*. On the index were many of the most significant books written
in Europe following the Reformation, including some written by Roman Catholic colleagues.

All countries also set up judicial and police machinery to enforce conformity to whatever the accepted church happened to be. The power of the state was once again brought into play to produce conformity to whatever religious view was established. In England, Elizabeth established the high commission to bring those who were rebellious into the Church of England. Also, bishops had their episcopal courts which served many of these same functions. The most dreaded of the courts was the Inquisition, which we’ve seen in earlier lectures. In reality these were two distinct kinds of organizations under the same name. The word itself is an old term from Roman law signifying a court of inquest or inquiry, but the two different groups are the Spanish and the Roman Inquisitions. The Spanish Inquisition was established about 1480 to ferret out Jewish and Islamic survivors in Spain. It was then introduced to other countries ruled by the Spanish crown and employed very effectively against Protestants, particularly in the Spanish Netherlands, which had become an important center for Calvinist thought.

The Roman or Papal Inquisition was established in Rome in 1542 under a permanent committee of cardinals called the Holy Office. This was a revival of the famous Medieval Tribunal which had been established in the thirteenth century for the detection of heresy in the church. Both of them, the Spanish and the Roman Inquisitions, employed torture to get the truth, for heresy was considered the supreme crime. The Roman form was probably a bit milder than the Spanish, but both of them used physical force and torture in order to gain their ends. These functioned mainly in Italy. They were used very little, if at all, in France.

The most powerful force, however, used by Jesuits and others to help Protestants return to the Catholic fold was political sovereignty itself. Where Protestants had won control of the government, the country usually became Protestant and vice versa. It was this clash of governments in war, that clash of Protestant against Roman Catholic in regional and governmental terms that would rage for a century at least following 1560. In 1560, the strongest powers of Europe, Spain, France, and Austria, were officially Catholic. The Protestant states were small or medium in size—Scandinavia, parts of Germany, England, and so on. England at that time had only about four million people. And we enter the period that we call the Wars of Religion, this period from 1560 to
roughly 1648. During this period, France, England, the dominions of the king of Spain, the Holy Roman Empire, were all torn by civil struggles in which religion was the prime issue, and all of these plus Denmark and Sweden fought in international wars in which religion was at stake. In fact, it’s interesting to conjecture as to the Spanish Armada. Had it landed in England, for example, it’s conceivable that Catholicism might have been restored there in that country.

Charles V, having tried in vain for thirty-five years to preserve religious unity in Germany, abdicated his many crowns and retired to a monastery in 1556. He left Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary to his brother Ferdinand, who was soon elected Holy Roman Emperor. All of his other possessions he left to his son Philip II of Spain. Thereafter, the Habsburg [or Hapsburg] dynasty, as it’s been called, remained divided into two branches, the Austrian and the Spanish. The two cooperated in European affairs. The Spanish for a century tended to be the more important and dominant. Philip II, who ruled from 1556 to 1598, not only possessed the Spanish kingdoms, but in 1580 he inherited Portugal. He also possessed provinces in the Netherlands and the free county of Burgundy, member states of the Holy Roman Empire. He held also parts of Italy and some islands in the Mediterranean, and for five years he was the titular head of England (1553–1558 [through his marriage to Mary I, the daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon]). And in 1589, in the name of his daughter, he laid claim to the throne of France. Also, in a sense, all of America belonged to Philip II; thus nearly all of the ships on open ocean were Philip's ships and under his control.

Philip II, for his part, was fervent and fanatic in his commitment to the Catholic Church. He was a grave, sober man sharing the moral severity of the Catholic Reform and the dark brooding and tormented inner world of the Spanish mystics. He felt he was to promote the Catholic counteroffensive, into which he poured the treasures of his kingdom. This was also the period of the height of Spanish culture, as some of you will remember. Cervantes wrote *Don Quixote* at this time. Lope de Vega, his seven hundred dramas. This was the time of El Greco, . . . Velazquez, and their marvelous paintings. In fact, I’ve had the privilege of standing in del Prado, which is the great museum in Madrid, and in that museum hang many of these great Spanish paintings. One of the most powerful of these is the face of Christ covered half of the face by hair painted by Velazquez in one of the most moving of all of the portrayals of our Lord anywhere in the world. I remember how captivated I was
by that and must have sat for half an hour or more just drawn into that powerful representation. There’s a kind of unique power to Spanish culture and art that oftentimes in the Western world we overlook or forget.

Culture was undergirded by the church. In 1600, perhaps as many of a third of the population in Spain were in one way or the other in the service of the church. Isn’t that incredible? Philip built himself a royal residence, the Escorial, in the bleak, arid plateau of central Castile, overlooking the jagged sierra. This was built in a shape of a grill in honor of Saint Lawrence, who had in AD 258 been roasted alive on a grill of burning coals, and you can see some of Philip’s own interest in this fascinating aspect of church life that is much more disciplined and somewhat painful. Escorial was designed not only as a palace, but a monastery and a mausoleum, and the monks moved in before the king. And here the slim figure of Philip dressed like a monk lived industriously, avid in every detail for finding ways of recapturing Europe for the Catholic Church. These were the kinds of dedicated folk who produced the atmosphere out of which many of these religious wars emerged.

The world situation at this time, mid-sixteenth century, when Philip took over was as follows: It was the beginning of Queen Elizabeth’s reign in England. France, then ruled by teenage boys, fell into civil war. The Netherlands was torn apart by its deep commitment to Calvinism. For about five years, beginning in 1567, it looked as if the Catholic cause might even prevail. The Counter Reformation had taken the offensive. Philip sent twenty thousand troops to the Netherlands to put down Calvinism there. In England the Catholics in the north were in revolt against Queen Elizabeth’s settlement. In France in 1572, three thousand Protestant Huguenots were put to death on the eve of St. Bartholomew’s Day, that famous massacre, and that was in Paris alone. It spread throughout the country when hundreds of others were put to death.

The Protestant concerns were, however, too deep to stamp out, even by such repression. And although in-depth studies of each of these areas would be very profitable, I would encourage you to dig out some writings in this area if have an interest and look at them in more depth. Let me focus for a few moments on Germany itself, which is maybe the most important of all the centers for these religious battles, and this surrounds the great Thirty Years’ War from 1618 to 1648.
The Holy Roman Empire extended from France on the west to Poland and Hungary on the east. It included the Czechs of Bohemia and sizable French-speaking populations in what are now Belgium, Lorraine, eastern Burgundy, and western Switzerland, but with these exceptions the kingdom was made up primarily of Germany.

In 1500, Germany had led the life of Europe. By 1600, however, it had become backward and very provincial. Probably more witches were burned in Germany than elsewhere. The population of the universities, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, declined over that century. Cultural output seemed to be on the decline. Banking had fallen into hard times. The Peace of Augsburg in 1555 had established the principle that each separate state had a right to determine its own religious practice. Remember that development. As the various areas chose Protestant or Catholic, it became increasingly probable that things were reaching ahead with exceedingly complex forces taking place in the larger European context. Things in Germany were moving toward a German civil war, fought between the Catholic and Protestants. There were other issues such as constitutional issues involved, but the primary core of these battles was religious. Most of the battles were fought also on German soil.

The struggles themselves resembled in some ways the croquet game in *Alice in Wonderland* where players used the necks of flamingos for mallets and hedgehogs for balls. It was too fluctuating, oblique, contradictory, and protracted to be recounted in any general cohesive way, yet it was undoubtedly the most important European war prior to the French Revolution. The fighting began in Bohemia; thus it’s customary to divide this war into four major phases: the Bohemian Phase, 1618 to 1625; the Danish Phase, 1625 to 1629; the Swedish Phase, 1630 to 1635; and the Swedish-French Phase, 1635 to 1648.

Let’s go back to the Bohemian Phase. In 1618, the Bohemian Czechs, fearing the loss of their Protestant liberties, threw two emissaries from the Holy Roman Empire right out the window. This is often called the Defenestration of Prague. The emperor, Matthias, sent troops to restore his authority, whereupon the Bohemians deposed Matthias and elected their own king, Frederick V, who was a Protestant. Emperor Ferdinand, Matthias’s successor, with money from the pope and help from the Spanish troops, won the country back at the Battle of the White Mountain in 1620, and you can see it moving back and forth. Ferdinand, elected emperor, actually was the king in Bohemia. He confiscated the nobles’ estates and gave them back to the church. Furthermore, the
Jesuits streamed in and re-Catholicized the land and essentially wiped out Protestantism within that region of the world.

The Danish Phase picks up under the Protestant leadership under the king of Denmark. Against him, Emperor Ferdinand raised another army, and the wars went on with a mixture of motives and foci until finally a peace was realized, what is often called the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 after all of these battles and counter-battles. This represented a general checkmate in the Counter Reformation in Germany. Not only did it renew the terms of the Peace of Augsburg, granting each German state the right to determine its religion, but it added Calvinism to Lutheranism, which remember had been the exclusive alternate to the Catholicism as acceptable faith within the land. It also forced a final blow to the dissolution to the Holy Roman Emperor in the empire. The Dutch and Swiss ceased to belong to it. France got some of the lands in Alsace. Sweden got land, and for nearly two centuries there was no move for German reunification. Physically, Germany was absolutely wrecked by the wars. The cities were sacked and looted, agriculture was ruined. Perhaps as many as a third of Germany’s population died. Politically, Germany was cut up into small pieces. France, as a result, became the giant power in Europe. The Thirty Years’ War then was devastating on Germany as any sort of political entity, and it was devastating in the life of the church upon tens of thousands of Catholics and Protestants alike who had gone to battle against one another for what they felt was a righteous cause, and yet the result of it was that many families were disseminated and churches and were emptied of their membership and much harm was done physically to many people.

The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 ended a whole generation of war and the centrality of strife. It ended the Thirty Years’ War. It ended the wars of religion in general. Wars thereafter seldom had religion as a primary pretext. It’s interesting to look at the more modern wars, which don’t tend to revolve around religious issues, so much as they do around political or territorial kinds of issues. Henceforth, doctrinal disputes tended to be settled within states rather than between them. Matters of faith never seemed to gain the kind of status that they had then in international relations. Consequently, the influence of popes tended to decline. Church leaders were seldom asked for their opinions on matters of state. There was a decline in the prestige of institutionalized religion. There was a growing tendency to move toward tolerance and toleration. By the early eighteenth century heresies were more
ignored than penalized within the life of the church. The quest
was for stability in the nation and the church.

The authority of the church, in short, was challenged by many
spheres, by the predominance of the political powers, by concerns
toward very practical needs of welfare, the sorts of bread-and-
butter issues which we talk about today in political life. Mainly,
however, the challenge against the church came from the
intellectual realm. There was a spirit of freedom which started
to emerge, and thinking and acting which ran counter to the
kind of absolutes of mission to divine will which we found in
the church in earlier years. One of the great voices of this new
world was Voltaire. This was a time of arrogant rationalism, which
challenged church dogma. By the mid-seventeenth century, we
stand on the threshold of the modern world. This is the period in
which we move really from medieval to modern. It was ushered
in by thinkers such as [Isaac] Newton, who interpreted nature in
some interesting new ways, and [John] Locke, who interpreted
the human mind and how it works. Most of these believed that
reason teaches us to understand the law which governs nature
and unfolds the patterns of beliefs more than revelation.

Religion, which focuses upon revelation alone, is not sufficient
religion. Religion must live on the foundation of reason, and, in
fact, some began to argue that religion ought to be practiced within
the confines of reason alone. Reason is adequate, many came to
believe, to lead people to faith. Therefore, what humans discover
by reason, by the use of their minds, tends to be more important
than revelation—what God has revealed in the authoritative
Word. The Scriptures, therefore, as you might understand, came
not only to be carefully scrutinized in those early years, but
came to be increasingly disregarded as a center for the life of the
church, and there was actually a decline in biblical theology and
in biblical studies generally. Some, of course, reacted against this
kind of direction. Rousseau and the Romantics are good examples
of those who repudiated this kind of rational intellectualism.

Pietism itself, about which we’ve spoken in the past, is another
good indication of some of the basic reaction which was held
in religious quarters toward this growing rationalist tendency.
Thus beneath the surface of the Age of Reason, many movements
began to emerge that still placed primary emphasis upon biblical
authority, upon the revelation which comes through experience
of encounter with God directly. You see that in the Jansenists
in France and Orthodox Jesuits, the Quietists in England, the
Puritans in the New World, the Methodists in England, the Pietists in Germany, and others. These are all good examples.

From the Peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution, that is, from 1648 to 1789, we find a period that I think we can call not very heroic, but out of it came modern society and, in fact, modern Christianity and the modern church, increasingly dominated by the Age of Reason. Despite the protesters, the forces of science and rationalism tended to take center stage, and these are going to become very important as we understand the life of the church and some of its struggles in future years.

Francis Bacon pointed in the direction of the scientific method, but Rene Descartes is one of the principal figures in unfolding this new basic understanding through his principles of thought. He was a Frenchman educated in Jesuit schools. He became a soldier, but he argued that we should not begin with our beliefs, but we should begin with our doubts. Test everything by reason. The criterion that we ought to use is a criterion of clearness and distinctness of the idea. This was picked up by [Baruch] Spinoza, for example, who was strongly influenced positively by Descartes, but it was strongly opposed by people like [Blaise] Pascal. Gradually, especially with Spinoza, Cartesian skepticism came to be seen as an acid eating deeply into Christian faith, as it had been traditionally understood. It was an enormous challenge to the church.

Pascal in his *Pensees* stresses faith as the central requisite, far more important than reason. “Demonstration,” he believed, “can never supplant or replace grace. Human reason ends us only in irrationality, not in genuine faith.”

In short, then, the seventeenth century began the change in thought which ushered in what we might call the modern, scientific age. It also provided the foundation for the expansion of trade and travel, the emphasis on the present rather than the future, the stress upon the domination of the church by the state, the growth of religious toleration, the emphasis upon the creation rather than the Creator. All of these forces, all of these modern developments placed enormous challenges before the church—Protestant as well as Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholics discovered that they were doing battle not only against
the Protestants, whom they had been fighting in those religious wars, but against the very culture itself. For all Christians, this exciting but increasingly difficult period lay just ahead.