

here in the sense necessarily of immorality. It is true that toward the end of the previous century some of the Popes were noted for their immorality - such as Alexander VI - but Leo X was not of that stamp nor was his second successor after his relative Clement (11.5). They were not men of that type but they were men whose interest was in worldly things, in politics, in art, in culture, in pleasures of every sort but not in religion. Religion to them was just a convenience. They had a position where they got good income through it and they were really very slightly interested. And the last thing you might say in the church to become greatly interested in religion, was the Papacy. It did not lead, it followed. But it was effective and the Papacy had to either become more interested in the welfare of the church, and not just the pleasure of the individual Pope, or it would of necessity, have died out. And so we find the Papacy reforming - it is changed to quite an extent in the next few years. But the change was a result of the Counter-Reformation, not a cause. The Pope did not see his regime threatened and jump in with vigor to change it. The Popes did not realize the danger. Leo X, some of his associates realized it, he hardly did. Adrian VI of course vigorously set forward to reform the Papacy while holding the old medieval ideas intact, but his greatest opposition came from his immediate court there at Rome, from his officers there. They were the ones who were least in sympathy with what he was trying to do and he died too soon to accomplish much. And then he was succeeded by Clement VII, a close relative, a former secretary of Leo X, another Medici who shared the attitude of Leo X and Clement VII during the years of his Papacy was profoundly interested in trying to keep the Emperor from getting too strong. And Charles V had to make war after war with the King of France and these wars were to some extent worked up by Clement VII, the Pope, who was thus constantly interfering with